

SAPPHO'S PRAYER TO APHRODITE

A. CAMERON

ABERDEEN

THE importance of Sappho's first poem as a religious document has long been recognized,¹ but there is still room for disagreement as to the position that should be assigned to it in a history of Greek religious experience. The difficulty lies in the interpretation of the language of the poem; not of its literal meaning, which is clear, but of its tone and color. Is the poem, as Bowra calls it, "a prayer intimate and serious"? Is it "after all a religious poem, concerned with an experience which can only be called mystical"? Or is it an exercise in a literary *genre*, charming indeed in the simple directness of its expression, but still conventional and not to be taken seriously as a religious utterance. Or, finally, does the truth lie somewhere between these two extremes?

Before an answer to these questions can be even attempted, it is necessary to examine in some detail the structure and language of the poem, though a merely literary analysis cannot be decisive. It belongs to the class of ὕμνοι and to the species of the ὕμνοι κλητικοί, but its occasion and its purely personal reference make it certain that it was not composed for any act of common worship;² it is a prayer rather than a hymn. This distinction is, in this case, of no importance for the literary form;³ the poem shows, on the scale appropriate to the monodic

¹ I have not thought it necessary to trace the source of all current opinions, but I am generally indebted to the following books and articles, which are quoted, when necessary, by the author's name: Wilamowitz, *Sappho und Simonides*; Wünsch, *Hymnos*, R.-E. IX, 1, cols. 140 ff.; Pfister, *Epiphanie*, R.-E., Suppl. IV, cols. 277 ff.; Fraenkel, *G. G. N.* 1924, p. 74; Schwenn, *Gebet und Opfer*; Pfeiffer, *Philologus* 84, 1929, p. 137; Keyssner, *Gottesvorstellung und Lebensauffassung im griechischen Hymnus*; H. Meyer, *Hymnische Stilelemente in der frühgriechischen Poesie*; Perrotta, *Illo e Pindaro*; Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*.

² Cf. Wilamowitz, p. 42.

³ Cf. Keyssner, p. 2.

lyric, the structural elements which are familiar in the hymn. Sappho's invocation is brief and includes two only of the conventional features; Aphrodite receives three honorific epithets (as usual, compound adjectives of epic type) and her genealogy is indicated in two words. There is no safe-guarding qualification in addressing her nor is there any recital of her powers and functions or of the lands and cities where she holds sway. The common formula which Sappho herself uses elsewhere, when she calls on Aphrodite "whether in Cyprian Paphos or Panormos," is also absent; it is possible, as has been suggested, that the epithet *ποικιλόθρονος* addresses the prayer to Aphrodite enthroned on Olympos and not to any of her earthly seats.⁴ After the invocation comes the first appeal, in negative and positive form, an appeal for pity⁵ and an appeal for present help (*παρουσία*) in the usual form of aorist imperative. The appeal is supported, as commonly, by another formula.⁶ The god may be called upon to do a service because he has received one, as Chryses⁷ calls upon Apollo: "Hear me, god of the silver bow, that standest over Chryse and holy Killa, and rulest Tenedos with might, O Smintheus! If ever I built a temple gracious in thine eyes, or if ever I burnt to thee fat flesh of thighs of bulls or goats, fulfill thou this my desire; let the Danaans pay by thine arrows for my tears." Sappho's appeal belongs to another class in which the god is reminded of previous occasions on which he has answered prayer. The simplest form of this class may be seen in Sophocles:⁸ "Shine forth on me, my threefold help against death! If ever aforetime, in arrest of ruin hurrying on the city, ye drove a fiery pest beyond our borders, come now also (*ἔλθετε καὶ νῦν*)."⁹ In Sappho, however, the repeated appeal *ἔλθε μοι καὶ νῦν* is separated from the

⁴ On another view, in my opinion less probable, the epithet is to be interpreted in the light of the *θρόνα ποικίλα* of Iliad XXII, 441; so Aly takes it (R.-E. 2, 1, col. 2375) as "die mit den bunten Blumen," with reference to flowers at her festivals; others have thought of embroidered robes. Aphrodite is *εὐθρονος* in Pindar, Isth. II, 5.

⁵ The goddess here, rather unusually, is the source of the sorrow which she is asked to dispel; cf. Keyssner, p. 97.

⁶ Schwenn, p. 52; Keyssner, p. 134.

⁷ Iliad I, 37 (Lang, Leaf and Myers).

⁸ O. T. 162 (Jebb); cf. the parody of this type in Aristophanes, Th. 1155. For *εἴ ποτε καὶ ἄλλοτε* in prayer at a later date, cf. LXX Macc. II, 13, 10.

αἶ ποτα κἀτέρωτα, to which it naturally belongs, by five stanzas. This long sentence may add something to the literary effect, but its attachment to the framework of the prayer is loose. The phrase αἶ ποτα κἀτέρωτα leads us to expect a more general allusion to previous acts of grace to be followed by the emphatic καὶ νῦν, but instead Sappho passes from the general to the particular and describes one special occasion on which Aphrodite came to bring her aid. This lapse into narrative has a striking parallel in the speech of Diomedes in Iliad X, 284 ff.: "Listen now likewise to me, thou child of Zeus, unwearied maiden, and follow with me as when with my father thou didst follow, even noble Tydeus, into Thebes, when he went forth as a messenger from the Achaeans. And then he left by the Asopos, the mail-clad Achaeans, and a honeyed word he bare to the Kadmeians in that place; but on his backward way he devised right terrible deeds, with thee, fair goddess, for eager didst thou stand by him. Even so now stand thou by me willingly, and protect me." In both prayers there is, from the point of view of the modern reader, a certain dramatic irrelevance; the circumstantial narrative, at first sight, appears to be addressed to the reader rather than to the deity. This lack of dramatic propriety is not uncommon in early Greek poetry. There is a striking example in Medea's speech to the Argonauts in Pindar's fourth Pythian ode and it occurs in various forms in both epic and tragedy. It is a feature rather akin to the epic technique by which similes are often developed beyond the point of contact with their context. It has been demonstrated, however, that the insertion of the narrative in these prayers is not due simply to a different canon of relevance. The parallels adduced by Dornseiff⁹ show that narrative had an original function in prayer, that the narration of past deeds had a potency in bringing about the performance of future actions. The application of exemplary narrative to a present occasion, such as is found in the fable and other forms of literature, is in

⁹ F. Dornseiff, *Literarische Verwendungen des Beispiels*, Vorträge der Bibl. Warburg 1924-1925, pp. 206 ff. But note that in the prayers of Sappho and Diomedes the narrative has a personal relevance; it is not a mere exaltation of the *δυνάμεις* and *πράξεις* of the god; cf. Schwenn, p. 61.

fact derived from a primitive form of spell. We may conclude then that Sappho, though perhaps not consciously using a magical device, was using a form of prayer which had survived in tradition, though it has left few traces in Greek literature. We shall see later that there are other traces in her poem of magical formulae. At the conclusion of the narrative the appeal is resumed and formulated in accordance with a common scheme. The substance of the appeal is given in general terms such as are used in Homer and elsewhere; for example: ¹⁰

Ζεὺς τοι δοίη, ξεῖνε, καὶ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι
ὅττι μάλιστ' ἐθέλεις, ὅτι με πρόφρων ὑπέδεξο.

Sappho herself ¹¹ makes use of the form in what is perhaps its more appropriate use, the general expression of good wishes for another:

τὸν κασί[γνητον δότε τνίδ' ἴκεσθα[ι,
κῶσσα ρ]οι θυμῳ κε θέλῃ γένεσθαι
πάντα τε[λέσθην.

The concluding phrase is also in the conventional manner; *τελεῖν*,¹² *λύειν*,¹³ and *ἰμείρειν*¹⁴ all belong to the religious vocabulary and the appeal to the god to be *σύμμαχος*¹⁵ is common in both the literal and metaphorical sense.

Enough has been said to show that Sappho's poem has a clearly articulated structure which conforms to fixed tradition.¹⁶ Even the central narrative, which has sometimes been taken as a more personal element breaking the conventional sequence, may, as we have seen, be regarded as appropriate to the traditional structure of a prayer.

¹⁰ Odyss. XIV, 53; cf. Odyss. XVII, 354. The formula persists, cf. Pap. Gr. Mag. I, 313, 320; IV, 451.

¹¹ *ā* 3 (Lobel).

¹² Aesch. Ag. 973; Keyssner, pp. 117 ff.; cf. Pfister, Epode, R.-E., Suppl. IV, col. 337.

¹³ Keyssner, pp. 110 ff.

¹⁴ Cf. Arist., Nub. 435, for *ἰμείρειν* in pseudo-sacral style.

¹⁵ Herodotus VIII, 64; Aesch., Ch. 2, 19; Sept. 266; Eur., Suppl. 630; Archil. 75 (Diehl). Schwenn uses this formula as the basis for some curious conclusions on racial psychology.

¹⁶ Pfeiffer, p. 144; Wilamowitz, Glaube II, p. 111, note 1, retracts his former view, Sappho und Sim. p. 42; cf. Keyssner, p. 110.

We may now examine more closely certain features of the language and style of the poem, with special reference to the description of Aphrodite's epiphany which forms its core. *Κλύειν* from Homer onwards is a favorite word in address to the gods. The goddess hears from afar because one of the virtues of deity is to perceive or act from a distance, as Poseidon spies Odysseus ¹⁷ *τηλόθεν ἐκ Σολύμων ὀρέων*. Aphrodite leaves her father's halls as Sappho elsewhere calls on the Muses to leave their golden home; ¹⁸ her chariot is of gold as all divine accoutrements are in Homer; ¹⁹ not only the black earth and the ether and the *πυκνὰ πτέρα* are Homeric but also the whole structure of the sentence with the imperfect tense of the process of the flight followed by the mark of arrival with *αἶψα* and the aorist, as in the description of Paris: ²⁰

τάχες δὲ πόδες φέρον· αἶψα δ' ἔπειτα
Ἑκτορα δῖον ἔτετμεν ἀδελφέον.

The goddess arrives with a smile on her immortal countenance. The immortal countenance is again Homeric; the hands, feet and heads of the gods are all immortal for the epic. The smile, however, is not merely that of *φιλομμειδής* Aphrodite; it is the gracious smile with which the gods are called on to appear to reassure their worshippers, as Dionysus ²¹ is summoned to come *γελῶντι προσώπῳ*.

I have gone into perhaps unnecessary detail in order to stress the point that the language and structure here are partly Homeric and partly in a conventional sacral style. The resemblances to Homer are hardly accidental, due merely to the necessity of using similar language to describe similar events, and one can hardly agree with Bowra when he says that "each detail is clear and unaffected. The house of Zeus is just 'golden'; the sparrows of Aphrodite's chariot flutter their wings like any

¹⁷ Odyss. V, 282; cf. Odyss. III, 231; Aesch., Eum. 297.

¹⁸ Inc. Lib. 12 (Lobel).

¹⁹ Cf. *ā* 6 App. (Lobel).

²⁰ Iliad VI, 514.

²¹ Eur., Bacch. 1021; cf. Keyssner, p. 127. The smile greets the worshipper who is *θεοφιλής*; for the *θεομάχος* the gods have a different countenance (Pfister, col. 319, §§ 49-50).

flight of birds; the earth they traverse is called naturally and rightly, 'black.'" The passage is certainly clear and in a way unaffected, but the sparrows flutter their wings like a Homeric flight of birds and the earth they traverse is called not naturally and rightly, but Homerically and conventionally, 'black.'

It is true, however, as Bowra insists, that the passage is not in the tradition of Homeric epiphany. "Neither the epic nor Archilochus describe visions of this character." There is generally a certain suddenness and unexpectedness in epiphany, as when Athena appears to Achilles or the *οιοπόλος δαίμων* meets the Argonauts.²² So Pindar himself met Alcmaeon,²³ *ὑπάντασεν ἰόντι γὰς ὀμφαλὸν παρ' αἰοιδίμον*; so Isyllus describes the meeting with Asklepios, *συναντήσας σὺν ὄπλοισιν λαμπόμενος χρυσέοις*.²⁴ This manner of appearance is a fixed tradition²⁵ and the terminology remains surprisingly constant. In Sappho this element of suddenness is absent, as is also the element of astonishment and fear, or pleasure mixed with fear,²⁶ which such appearances commonly produce. Even where the god appears in answer to prayer the appearance may be sudden, as when Pelops called upon Poseidon,²⁷

ὁ δ' αὐτῷ
παρ ποδὶ σχεδὸν φάνη.

Can we explain Sappho's departure from the usual type of epiphany description by arguing that she had no tradition to draw upon and was describing an actual visionary experience? It is true that Sappho's description differs from most others in that she is describing something which happened to herself and not merely narrating, but this difference arises out of the literary form of the personal lyric. Nor is it quite true that there was no tradition for the description of such a personal vision. Hesiod's vision of the Muses on Helicon, which exercised such

²² Pindar, *Pyth.* IV, 25.

²³ *Pyth.* VIII, 59.

²⁴ L. 69.

²⁵ Pfister, col. 280; the familiarity of the type is shown by the simple allusive use of *ἀπαντᾶν* in Arist., *Nub.* 425.

²⁶ Pfister, col. 317, §§ 42-44.

²⁷ Pindar, *Ol.* I, 73.

an enormous influence on later literature, equally professes to be the record of personal experience. Opinions may differ as to what is *πιθανόν* in such descriptions. To my mind the language and manner of Sappho suggest the literary inspiration of the epic, of such passages as the coming of Apollo in answer to the prayer of Chryses²⁸ or the flight of Hera's chariot.²⁹ In other words, her picture recalls those passages in which Homer describes the gods as actors in the story, whose actions he can describe as accurately and fully as those of his other characters, and not those which reflect the real religious tradition of epiphany and its effect on mortals. This is an important point to which it will be necessary to return.

When Aphrodite speaks to Sappho she speaks in a tone of friendly impatience marked by the threefold repetition of *δηῦτε*; her implied question *τί πέπονθας*; is colloquial and friendly like Menander's³⁰ *τί πέπονθας τέκνον*; and the *πάτερ πάτερ τί πέπονθας*; of Aristophanes;³¹ so also is her *τίς σ', ὦ Ψάπφ', ἀδικήεις*, the importance of which will appear later. It recurs in dialogue in Plato,³² *μὴν τί σε ἀδικεῖ Πρωταγόρας*; and in Aristophanes,³³ *τίς ὦ Παφλαγῶν ἀδικεῖ σε*; The tone of familiarity between Gods and men is of course well-known in Homer and elsewhere. "*τίπτ' αὐτ' αἰγίοχοιο Διὸς τέκος εἰλήλουθας*;" says Achilles to Athena³⁴ and Helen addresses Aphrodite herself in tones of some impatience,³⁵ "*δαιμονίη, τί με ταῦτα λιλαίει ἡπεροπέειν*;" So too Athena³⁶ talks familiarly to Odysseus, "*σχέτλιε, ποικιλομήτα δόλων ἄτ' οὐκ ἄρ' ἔμελλες κτλ.*" This tone is not surprising in Homer, whose gods are comparatively humanized, but even later in a very different religious context the utterances of the gods often have a familiar ring, as when Asklepios speaks to Proklos:³⁷ "*Τί δαί; Ἰαμβλίχου οὐκ ἀκήκοας λέγοντος τίνες οἱ δύο καὶ ὑμνοῦντος Μαχάονά τε καὶ Ποδαλείριον*;" The direct speech itself, apart from the phraseology, helps to convey the impression of intimacy. It recalls the use of direct speech in choral lyric which may be derived from the practice of Homer, but

²⁸ Iliad I, 43.

²⁹ Iliad V, 767.

³⁰ Georg. 84.

³⁷ Marinos, Vita Procli 32. Cf. Schwenn, p. 46.

³¹ Vesp. 995.

³² Prot. 310 d.

³³ Equ. 730.

³⁴ Iliad I, 299.

³⁵ Iliad III, 399.

³⁶ Odyss. XIII, 293.

the passage from indirect to direct speech is not unnatural in writing which has a colloquial touch. The direct speech has a certain convincingness and, perhaps for that reason, is not uncommon in descriptions of epiphany.³⁸ The most famous example is that in Acts, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" In Isyllus,³⁹ as in Sappho, the god's words are repeated to him:

τὸ δέ μοι τὰδ' ἔλεξας ἑναργῇ,
 "Θάρσει· καιρῷ γάρ σοι ἀφίξομαι, ἀλλὰ μέν' αὐτεῖ."

The rarity of such examples is due simply to the rarity of occasions on which a previous epiphany is related to the god himself.

The last stanza of Aphrodite's speech is couched in a form which has magical associations. She promises to exercise her δύναμις to bring about a reversal of present circumstances by compulsion of an unwilling victim. The antithetical form of expression has parallels in the magical papyri, in P. Gr. Mag. I, 125, for example,⁴⁰ and in the love spell of P. Gr. Mag. IV, 1511 which bears more closely on our passage: εἰ κάθηται, μὴ καθήσθω, εἰ λαλεῖ πρὸς τινα, μὴ λαλείτω, εἰ ἐμβλέπει τινί, μὴ ἐμβλεπέτω, εἰ προσέρχεται τινί, μὴ προσερχέσθω, εἰ περιπατεῖ, μὴ περιπατείτω, εἰ πίνει, μὴ πινέτω, εἰ ἐσθίει, μὴ ἐσθιέτω, εἰ καταφιλεῖ τινα, μὴ καταφιλείτω, εἰ τέρπεται τινί ἡδονῇ, μὴ τερπέσθω, εἰ κοιμᾶται, μὴ κοιμάσθω. It recurs also in the more general words of an inscription of Orta Köy:

εὐχαριστῶ Μητρὶ
 Λητῷ, ὅτι ἐξ ἀδυνά-
 των δυνατὰ πυνεί.⁴¹

³⁸ Good examples of the use of direct speech in popular religious documents will be found in the dream-reports in Wilcken, *Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit*, nos. 77-81; it is not, however, confined to these (cf. *ibid.*, nos. 52 and 57) and no doubt characterized popular narrative in general, as it still does in colloquial English. The use of this device is in keeping with the character of monodic lyric; Sappho employs it again in ε 3 and Aphrodite was probably quoted also in δ 7 and Inc. Lib. 44 (Wilamowitz, *Glaube II*, p. 111, note 1). ³⁹ L. 72.

⁴⁰ ὁπόταν τε θέλῃς [τὰ θερ]μὰ ψυχρὰ ποιῆσαι καὶ τὰ ψυχρὰ θερμά, λύχνους ἀνά[ψαι κ]αὶ κατασβέσει πάλιν.

⁴¹ Steinleitner, *Die Beicht*, p. 59, no. 31. Cf. Pap. Gr. Mag. XXIX: δὸς τὰ [ἄβ]ατα εἴβατα.

The word *ταχέως* also has a touch of magic. To perform a task quickly is the mark of power and in later magical literature the god or spirit is commonly called upon to bring about the desired effect *ἤδη ἤδη ταχὺ ταχύ*. So also *οὐκ ἐθέλοισα*, though it has other associations, can be paralleled in the papyri.⁴² These resemblances can hardly be accidental. Love is above all a sphere of private interest in which religion and magic are hard to distinguish. It is true that the magical papyri are separated by almost a millennium from Sappho, but they preserve old formulae and in this matter tradition was strong. There are some well-known traces of magic in Homer⁴³ and in Pindar also, in the description of the prayers of Pelops and Iamos,⁴⁴ there are magical elements. Pindar also supplies a parallel to *ταχέως*; when he has described the magical use of the wry-neck on its wheel to conquer Medea's heart,⁴⁵ he goes on:

*καὶ τάχα πείρατ' ἀέθλων
δείκνυν πατρῶων.*

In the corrupt sentence, which is so unhappily unhealed, there may have been another word, *ἄγειν*, which is technical in love magic and even, if *Πειθώ* is the goddess, an example of the use of an *ἄγγελος* to perform a magic function, such as is found in later magical texts.⁴⁶

It is clear then, if our argument is sound, that Sappho's prayer approaches the spell not only in that feature of its structure to which allusion was made above but also in its language. Aphrodite's words imply that in the past she was called upon to act as the magician summons his spirit to act and as Sappho wishes her to act again.⁴⁷ It does not follow, however, that Sappho feels herself in the same relation to the goddess as the magician to his familiar spirit. She uses the language of

⁴² Pap. Gr. Mag. IV, 2934.

⁴³ Abt, *Die Apologie des Apuleius*, p. 169.

⁴⁴ Ol. I and VI.

⁴⁵ Pyth. IV, 220. There is another trace of magical formula in the phrase *ὄφρα Μηδείας τοκέων ἀφέλοιτ' αἰδῶ* which is paralleled, for example, in Pap. Gr. Mag. IV, 2758, *ληθομένη τέκνων συνηθείης τε τοκήων*.

⁴⁶ The verb *πείθειν* also, in this context, has associations with the spell; cf. Pfister, *Epode, R.-E., Suppl. IV*, col. 329.

⁴⁷ For epiphany in response to prayer and spell, cf. Pfister, cols. 304 ff., §§ 27-28.

appeal to a higher power and not that of compulsion to an inferior.

In the phrase *τίς σ', ὦ Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει*; we have a clue to the form of the appeal. It has already been noted that these words, like the implied question *τί πέπονθας*; are friendly and familiar in tone, but they are also in a sense formal; they recall unmistakably the customary formula of the cry for help in distress,⁴⁸ the cry which appeals to gods and men to aid the victim of injustice. Sappho's cry, it is true, is not an appeal for protection against *βία*; the *ἀδικία* is faithlessness in love and on earth no hue and cry can be raised against the fugitive lover. But this treachery is a flouting of Aphrodite's power, a violation of her *pax*⁴⁹ which demands her intervention. The history of this formula of appeal and the customary usage of which it is the linguistic expression have been expounded by Schulze in a masterly essay⁵⁰ and the citation of a few of the passages adduced by him will be sufficient to show that Sappho's language is based on a well established usage and that her poem can thus be used indirectly to fill a gap in the history of the transmission of this motive in literature between Homer and Tragedy.

When Sappho says *τὰς ἑμας αὐδὰς αἰόισα . . . ἦλθες* her words are like those of Homer:⁵¹

*οἱ δὲ βοῆς αἰόντες ἄμ' ἡοῖ φαινομένηφιν
ἦλθον,*

and of Euripides,⁵² *κραυγῆς ἀκούσας ἦλθον*. Aphrodite comes when she hears the *βοή* of her worshipper as the good neighbor is bound to come to help his neighbor or the *προστάτης* to help the victim of *βία*. So too *τί πέπονθας*; and *τίς σ' ἀδικήει* reflect exactly the cry of the victim as it appears, for example, in Euripides:⁵³ *ἀδικούμεθ' ὦ γυναῖκες* and *δαινὰ δαινὰ πεπόνθαμεν*. Even the *τυλὶδ' ἔλθε* is in keeping with the form,⁵⁴ though it is no doubt to be regarded as belonging rather to the style of the hymn.

⁴⁸ Cf. W. Schulze, BSB. 1918, pp. 481-511 (Kleine Schriften, pp. 160-189).

⁴⁹ Cf. Schulze, Kl. Schr., p. 171 f.

⁵¹ ξ 266 = ρ 435; cf. ι 401, κ 118, χ 77 and 133.

⁵³ Helena 550; Hecuba 1091.

⁵⁰ Op. cit.

⁵² Hecuba 1109.

⁵⁴ Aesch. Agam. 1349.

At a later date the same formula persists in an altered but still recognizable form. Schulze has shown how the appeal to the πόλις or to the Quirites was transformed into an appeal to Caesar or his agents and it seems probable that a similar development took place also in Egypt, where the appeal to the king or his representative appears in the form of the written ἔντευξις or ὑπόμνημα. The papyri supply numerous examples of this type of appeal for βοήθεια against injustice. In Wilcken, Urkunden der Ptolemäerzeit, no. 2, for example, immediately after the address comes the sentence, Ἰαδικούμαι ὑπὸ Νεφόριτος τῶν ἀπὸ Μέμφεως, next the statement of the case, and at the end the appeal for pity and justice in negative and positive terms which recall those of our prayer, Ἀξιῶ οὖν σε μὴ περιδεῖν με περισπώμενον κτλ. No. 52 is a specially instructive example;⁵⁵ after the address the ὑπόμνημα continues:

Μνήστητι, ἐπέδοκά σοι τὴν παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐσφραγισμένην περὶ τῶν διδυμῶν (ἔντευξιν) καὶ εἰπὰς μοι ἐνόπι τοῦ Σάραπι· "Ἐπειδὴ ἐν κατοχῇ εἶ, τίς οὖν περὶ ταῦτα ἔσται;"

Here the recalling to mind of a previous meeting and the quotation of the addressee's own words in direct speech are strikingly parallel. The description of a previous epiphany is a way of reminding the god that the worshipper is not some unknown but one who has established an earlier claim to a hearing. In both cases the direct speech is a simple but effective device for this purpose. This quasi-legal appeal to the deity, parallel to the secular ὑπόμνημα, is known from other sources. There is an early and celebrated example in the curse of Artemisia⁵⁶ and at a very much later date the custom is authenticated by an inscription of Kula⁵⁷ which records the punishment of the wrong-doer:

Ἄρτε-
μίδωρος πιττάκιον ἔ-
δωκεν· ὁ θεὸς ἐκολά-
σετο τὸν Ἐρμογένην.

⁵⁵ For others see *ibid.*, nos. 7, 16, 18, 19.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵⁷ Steinleitner, *Die Beicht* p. 34, no. 10 (for πιττάκιον see, e.g., *Pap. Gr. Mag.* I, 12, 238; II, 12, 56; III, 165; IV, 1895, 2074, 2393, etc.); cf. also Pfister, col. 297, for the intervention of deities as guardians of justice.

These two examples reflect the popular custom of making the appeal in writing, which may be alluded to again in Apuleius.⁵⁸

If we are justified in making use of these magical and legal analogies, we may conclude that the central narrative of Sappho's poem bears traces of religious usage not entirely in keeping with the literary color of the rest of her prayer. This conclusion is of some importance. It has been shown⁵⁹ that in Homer the full and clear knowledge of the gods shown by the poet in narrative is opposed to the vague conceptions put into the mouths of his characters and this fact assists to some extent in helping us to make a distinction between the literary presentation of religion and the real religious attitude of men. Our discussion of the epiphany in Sappho enables us, I think, to make a somewhat similar distinction. The beginning and end of the poem and the description of Aphrodite's flight are in a conventional form, the literary form of the hymn strongly influenced by the epic style; Aphrodite's words, on the other hand, reflect a living form of appeal to the goddess such as in ordinary practice would be made in a less literary and schematic but more circumstantial form than that of the hymn.

Before we proceed to general conclusions, it may be noted finally that the poem contains numerous traces of a conventional erotic vocabulary. *δάμνημι* is familiar from Homer of Aphrodite's power. The *μέριμναι* of love re-appear in Theognis⁶⁰ and frequently elsewhere down to a late date. In Theognis⁶¹ too Aphrodite gives *λύσις ἐκ χαλεπῶν*. *Ἄδικεῖν* is common⁶² of the treacherous friend or faithless lover. The unwilling lover⁶³ is almost proverbial and flight and pursuit⁶⁴ are technical in the vocabulary of love. It is true that many or most of such parallels are later than Sappho and it might be

⁵⁸ Abt, op. cit., pp. 284 f. This custom has to be reckoned with against Kern's emphatic statement (*Die Religion der Gr.* I, p. 151), "die innigsten Gebete sind niemals aufgeschrieben worden."

⁵⁹ Cf. Ehnmark, *The Idea of God in Homer*, pp. 64 ff.

⁶⁰ L. 1323.

⁶¹ L. 1385.

⁶² Archil. 79 (Diehl); Epicharmus, 286; Theognis, l. 1283; Plato, *Phaedr.* 252c.

⁶³ Cf. Theognis, ll. 352; 1094.

⁶⁴ Cf. Theognis, ll. 1287; 1299; 1355.

argued that she is the model for later imitators, or at least that for her such expressions had not lost their first freshness. It seems more probable that she is influenced in this sphere, as in the religious, by an already established tradition. Her language may be simple and direct, but its simplicity and directness result not from the artless record of feeling and experience but from the highly skilful metrical and stylistic treatment of materials already conventional. We do not find in Sappho any more than in Homer any artless gropings after forms or means of expression.

We may now return to the question with which we started. The view that this poem reflects a deeply religious experience has been widely held. Geffcken,⁶⁵ for example, says of the phrase *τίς σ', ὦ Ψάπφ', ἀδικήει*; that it is as deeply religious in feeling as the suppliant words *σὺ δ' αὖτα σύμμαχος ἔσσο*. According to Pfeiffer,⁶⁶ Sappho calls upon Aphrodite "aus der letzten inneren Not, aus dem persönlichsten seelischen Leid"; her appeal is "der Hilferuf des rasenden (*μαινόλα*), sehnenenden (*ιμέρρει*) *θυμός*, Sappho's Seele, die nach Erfüllung (*τέλεσσαι*), nach Erlösung (*λῦσον*) verlangt." An even more extreme view, that the poem is to be taken at its face value as a record of actual experience, has been persuasively advanced by Bowra.⁶⁷ I had better quote his own words. "The remarkable candour and honesty of this poem raises another question about its contents. In it Sappho says quite plainly that Aphrodite appeared to her. In later literature such a statement might be dismissed as poetical invention, and its introduction attributed to the convention which allows poets who are in love to see the powers which govern love. But these conventions are the product of a long history, and have themselves grown out of the real experience of men like Dante, for whom the excitements of love possessed a definitely mystical character. With Sappho

⁶⁵ Gr. Literaturgesch. I, Anmerk. p. 95, note 191.

⁶⁶ P. 145.

⁶⁷ Pp. 193 f. Bowra's view is the extreme form of that held by Geffcken (op. cit., I, p. 90) and Wilamowitz (Glaube II, p. 111) who think of the poem as the record of a vision seen *ὄναρ* rather than *ὑπαρ*. The same question arises in connection with Hesiod and the distinction was not always clear or indeed of much importance; cf. Pfister, col. 281.

there can be no question of such a tradition. Neither the epic nor Archilochus describe visions of this character, and the inevitable conclusion is that Sappho really believed that she had seen Aphrodite and that this poem, with all its accuracy and truth to nature, is after all a religious poem, concerned with an experience which can only be called mystical."

The decision in a question of this kind must depend on factors which are to some extent imponderable. A great number of epiphanies have been recorded in ancient and modern times and, without knowledge of the persons concerned, it is impossible to tell which are true records, in the sense that a vision was actually seen or a voice heard.⁶⁸ No valid argument can be drawn from style. There is a remarkable continuity of structure and terminology in the hymn from the earliest times down to the Christian era and there is a similar continuity in the type of epiphany. The true no less than the false would be couched in the standard form and, on the other hand, fiction may be expressed as convincingly as truth. To prove, therefore, that the structure of Sappho's poem and much of its phraseology are conventional tells us little. Even literary inspiration in the form is not incompatible with sincerity of emotion and truth of content.⁶⁹ Nevertheless certain considerations to which we have already alluded tell against Bowra's view. The language and style of the poem and the use of the epiphany motive in Hesiod⁷⁰ suggest that the influence of tradition has been underestimated. The personal form of Sappho's record can hardly be taken as inevitably proving its truth. The idea of epiphany was common long before Sappho; the motive appears in an already established form in Homer and it must have been familiar at an early date in temple records and local traditions.⁷¹ Unless we assume

⁶⁸ Pfister, col. 316, § 41.

⁶⁹ Meyer, p. 52; this view does not conflict with Kern's (op. cit., p. 151) that "das Gebet ist eigentlich gar keine Literatur." No one is likely to suppose that actual prayers were couched in a literary form quite like that of Sappho's poem, though as we have seen they were sometimes written and no doubt regularly followed a standard pattern.

⁷⁰ Cf. E. Reitzenstein in *Festschr. R. Reitzenstein*, p. 54; Wilamowitz takes Hesiod's description also as the record of a real experience (*Glaube II*, p. 110; cf. Pfister, col. 317).

⁷¹ Pfister, col. 299, § 23.

that Sappho was incapable of writing in her own person of anything but a real experience, there is no special reason why we should not regard her poem as an exercise in the style of prayer. The work both of Sappho and Alcaeus shows that sacral forms had already been adapted to secular literature. This is merely one instance of a process which could be illustrated from many other branches of Greek literature. To regard the poem in this way does not mean that the emotion it expresses is entirely spurious.

What then is the tone of the poem? According to Bowra, "when (Sappho) saw Aphrodite, the vision was clear and stayed in her memory with its details. The fact is of the greatest importance. For it shows that for Sappho the whole question of love was connected with that divine exaltation which is usually the privilege of saints." If this conclusion could be accepted, it would be of the greatest interest for Greek literature and indeed for literature in general, for it would present us with an early treatment of a love theme in a manner which is not often found in the ancient world. It would be of great interest also for the history of Greek religious experience. The kind of devotion which is indicated is not common in the Greek literary tradition;⁷² it is in fact a type which, for various reasons, was unlikely to arise in aristocratic Greek society. It might be supposed that the peculiar circumstances which made Sappho a poetess might equally have made of her a mystical visionary, but there is little support for that view in what remains of her work. There is, moreover, a further point which tells against this mystical interpretation. Bowra's view of Sappho's religious attitude seems to rest precisely on those parts of the poem which our analysis suggests are particularly influenced by literary and especially epic narrative tradition. To my mind the description of Aphrodite's flight has none of the accuracy of observation and truth to nature; it is rather Homeric and conventional. The 'golden' chariot,⁷³ the 'black' earth, the 'im-

⁷² For opinions on 'mysticism' at this period, see Perrotta, p. 23; Kern, *op. cit.*, I, p. 246.

⁷³ To take *χρυσιον* with *δόμον* is grotesque from every point of view but that of mere concord; cf. Wilamowitz, p. 45, note 1.

mortal' countenance, the 'fluttering wings' ⁷⁴ (if that is the meaning), have a certain emotive effect, but the effect is that of literary allusion; they give the vision a local habitation not in Sappho's Lesbos but in the bright world of Homer's fancy. It is true that epic narrative might have affected the form of religious experience in persons whose minds were full of Homeric memories, but the evidence suggests rather that persons disposed by nature to such experience would be moulded in the different tradition of epiphany which has been referred to above. The real clue to the living religion which underlies the literary expression is to be found in the words of Aphrodite. Here we are on the solid ground of ancient religious belief and practice, and the relationship to the divinity to which the passage points is very different from visionary mysticism or divine exaltation.

If we reject the fundamentalist view, can we still consider the poem as the expression of a deep religious emotion? Here also the answer must depend on personal taste and feeling. To my thinking, it is not one of special emotional urgency but rather one in which what seriousness there is accompanied by a vein of prettiness and almost of playfulness. ⁷⁵ It is true that Sappho addresses the goddess in the conventional language of religious appeal, but Aphrodite's words show that she at least regards Sappho's pains as but *κοῦφαι μέριμναι*.

When all deductions are made the poem still retains a certain importance for the history of Greek religion. While we may not be inclined to draw from it such far-reaching conclusions as others have drawn with regard to the religious ethos of Sappho herself, it does afford us a glimpse of religious usage in keeping with Greek tradition but not otherwise authenticated for Sappho's time and place. It affords us also, in spite of its brevity, a useful example of the way in which living religion can sometimes be detected beneath a conventional literary form. It has been no part of our purpose to deal with the poem as a

⁷⁴ Curiously unfitted for their task, as Wilamowitz notes, p. 45.

⁷⁵ Professor Nock points out that certain literary forms which are apt to be regarded as Hellenistic can be traced in non-Attic writers at a much earlier date.

work of literature, but our analysis of its religious aspects has been in a sense also literary; it is the contrast between the vivid and intimate picture of the epiphany and the more formal style of the framework in which it is set that gives the poem much of its charm.



BOETHIUS'S CONSOLATIO PHILOSOPHIAE AS A SEQUEL TO AUGUSTINE'S DIALOGUES¹ AND SOLILOQUIA

EDMUND T. SILK

YALE UNIVERSITY

BOISSIER long ago remarked that Augustine's Dialogues (that is, the *Contra Academicos*, *De Beata Vita* and *De Ordine*) reminded him in a way of Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae*.² He was dealing with the vexed question of Boethius's Christianity. It seemed to him that Boethius in dealing purely philosophically in the *Consolatio* with problems lying more or less within the domain of theology had done nothing more than

¹ In this paper the term Dialogues includes *Contra Academicos* (abbreviated Ac.), *De Beata Vita* (B.V.), *De Ordine* (O.), edited by Pius Knöll, CSEL (1922), LXIII. The Soliloquia are quoted from Migne, PL, XXXII. References to the *Consolatio* indicate the Loeb Library edition of Stewart and Rand (1926). The most important article on the Dialogues is that of Adolf Dyroff, 'Über Form und Begriffsgehalt der augustini-schen Schrift *De Ordine*' in Aurelius Augustinus Festschrift der Görres-Gesellschaft zum 1500. Todestage des heiligen Augustinus, edited by Grabmann and Mausbach (Köln, 1930), pp. 15-62. Dyroff cites most previous literature on the Dialogues. See also in the same volume the article by Joseph Geyser, 'Die erkenntnistheoretischen Anschauungen Augustins zu Beginn seiner Schriftstellerischen Tätigkeit,' pp. 63-86. Sister Mary Inez Bogan's *The Vocabulary and Style of the Soliloquies and Dialogues of St. Augustine* (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, XLII, 1935) contains a bibliography, pp. ix-x. Most of the bibliog.aphy relating to Boethius will be found in H. R. Patch, *The Tradition of Boethius* (New York, Oxford University Press, 1935), pp. 127-191. An exhaustive bibliography relating chiefly to the *Opuscula Sacra* is given by Father Viktor Schurr, *Die Trinitätslehre des Boethius* (Forsch. zur christl. Lit.-u. Dogmengesch., XVIII, 1 heft, Paderborn, 1935), pp. xii-xxx. See also Prof. Rand's review in *Speculum*, XI (1936), 153-156. The letters 'p' and 'm' used in citations of the *Consolatio Philosophiae* refer respectively to 'prose' and 'metre'.

² Gaston Boissier, 'Le Christianisme de Boèce,' *Journal des Savants* (1889), pp. 449-462, especially pp. 460-462. Boissier said in part: 'Nous possédons de Saint Augustin un certain nombre de dialogues philosophiques . . . qui rappellent souvent la Consolation de Boèce. Je ne veux pas dire qu'ils lui soient tout à fait semblables. Derrière le langage d'école, dont Saint Augustin affecte de se servir, on entrevoit mieux le Christianisme . . . mais partout ailleurs il n'est question que de la philosophie. . . . Elle est le chemin qui mène à la vertu et elle fournit les moyens d'arriver jusqu' à Dieu . . . le seul effet qu'il ait retiré des paroles de l'apôtre, c'est de lui faire mieux voir la face auguste de la philosophie (*tanta mihi se Philosophiae facies aperuit* [Ac. II, 6]). Sans doute la situation de saint Augustin n'est pas tout à fait aussi critique en ce moment que celle de Boèce: il n'est pas prisonnier et près de mourir; elle est grave pourtant, puisqu'il travaille à rompre tout à fait avec son existence passée. . . .'

Augustine had done at Cassiciacum and that he was probably following Augustine's example. This meant that Boethius was just as much a Christian and probably the same sort of Christian as the young Augustine. Boissier did not carry his analysis of the resemblance between the two any farther. His observation was approved by Labriolle³ and has been recalled by Raoul Carton to illustrate his characterization of Boethius's Christianity.⁴ In spite of the numerous studies of Boethius's sources and style that have appeared since Boissier wrote, none, as far as I know, has explored the literary implications of his observation.⁵ Since it is quite true that a reader fresh from a perusal of the *Consolatio* is likely to detect in the *Dialogues* something that is distinctly 'Boethian' (beyond the use of a 'scholastic method'), it has seemed worth while to me to attempt an analysis of it and to suggest an explanation. It should be stated at the outset that this modest essay does not reopen the closed question of Boethius's religion, attempt a fresh explanation of his motives in choosing the philosophic style,⁶ or deal primarily with philosophic questions. It is not, moreover, a source-study in the ordinary sense. Nearly every discovery of Boethius's supposed or real debt to earlier writers has brought with it fresh evidence of Boethius's power to mould and transmute what he borrowed.⁷ The search for Boethius's sources of inspiration in a way resembles the intricate problem faced by Mr. Lowes in *The Road to Xanadu*. Boethius wrote

³ P. de Labriolle, *Histoire de la Littérature Latine Chrétienne* (Paris, 1920), p. 672. Cf. A. Fortescue and G. D. Smith in their edition of the *Consolatio* (London, Burns Oates and Washbourne, 1925), p. xxxi.

⁴ Raoul Carton, 'Le Christianisme et l'Augustinisme de Boèce,' *Revue de Philosophie*, XXX (1930), 657.

⁵ No one, as far as I have been able to discover, except Boissier, Labriolle, Fortescue and Carton ever mentions Augustine's *Dialogues* in connection with the *Consolatio Philosophiae*.

⁶ Cf. Schurr, *op. cit.*, pp. 10, 220.

⁷ Cf. E. K. Rand, 'On the Composition of Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae*,' *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XV (1904), 1-28; *Founders of the Middle Ages* (Harvard University Press, 1929), pp. 163 ff. See also Carton, *op. cit.*, pp. 580-582. Pierre Courcelle in 'Boèce et l'école d'Alexandrie,' *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire*, LII (1935), 185-223, would see in Boethius chiefly a transmitter of the Alexandrian learning of his own day. He is inclined to think that Boethius learned his Greek and received his training in Alexandria itself.

without reference books. What he borrowed he took from his own store of reflections based on reading long since become part of himself. It has been my intention never to lose sight of this fact for a moment while speculating upon the possible literary influence of St. Augustine's Dialogues and Soliloquia on the composition of the Consolatio.

In spite of immediately obvious differences between the Dialogues⁸ and the Consolatio, the two works have something important in common, that is, the concept of Philosophy as the physician and guide of choice spirits in their quest of the *summum bonum*. In the Dialogues Philosophy appears only in fleeting glimpses and never fully reveals herself. Moreover her cure is hardly more than promised and, as it were, adumbrated. Philosophy is behind a cloud at Cassiciacum. As for the quest of the *summum bonum*, in which Philosophy promises to be the guide, it can scarcely be said to do more than begin in the Dialogues. In the Consolatio Philosophiae this is all different. It is my opinion — I can hardly say conclusion, since positive demonstration is not thought of — that the Dialogues (supplemented by the Soliloquia), being rich in suggestion for an Augustinian of Boethius's background and training, inspired him to write the Consolatio as a sequel, for the Consolatio translates into dramatic accomplishment the project that is only foreshadowed in the Dialogues.

It seems scarcely necessary to raise the question whether Boethius can have known the Dialogues. He was a deep student of Augustine, as we know from his own acknowledgment and the findings of modern scholars.⁹ It is true that he nowhere explicitly refers to these early works by name or gives any posi-

⁸ For the present I am considering only the relation of the Dialogues to Boethius. The Soliloquia are reserved for treatment later on.

⁹ Cf. Boethius, *De Tr.* (Stewart and Rand, 1926), p. 4, 31 ff.; Rand, 'Comp. of Boethius's Cons.,' p. 18; Fr. Klingner, 'De Boethii Cons. Phil.,' *Philol. Unters. her. v. A. Kiessling u. U. v. Wilam.-Moell.* XXVII (1921), 5, 6, 71, 72, 99, 100, 101, 103, 104, 108, 110, 111; Konrad Bruder, *Die philosoph. Elemente in den Op. Sacra des Boethius* (Leipzig, 1928), pp. 12, 23, 24, 27, 28, 32, etc.; Carton, *op. cit.*; Schurr, *op. cit.* This is scarcely an exhaustive list; it is merely intended to show that Boethius's acquaintance with Augustine is a matter of common knowledge, or, at least, commonly accepted.

tive indication that he included them in his reading.¹⁰ On the other hand, is it likely that these exquisite little works, that are unquestionably the finest examples of the dialogue in Latin, if not worthy of higher praise, could have escaped the attention of a great Augustinian and a scholar that in his own day and since has been credited with a knowledge of most ancient philosophical literature? These works have been strangely neglected by modern students of Latin literature, but it is likely that Boethius had them in his hands at an early age and found much food for thought in them. Rather than labor this point unnecessarily, I prefer to turn to a comparison of the Dialogues and the Consolatio.

As Boissier remarked, we are not dealing with works that are 'tout à fait semblables.' At first glance there are obvious and glaring differences. The Consolatio is too well known and has been well described too often to require detailed analysis here.¹¹ It will suffice to recall that Boethius presents in alternate passages of verse and prose the account of a supernatural visitation. Philosophia suddenly looms above the head of the grief-stricken philosopher, sternly banishes the Muses that are aggravating his malady with their sentimental dictates, then, restoring his sight, by gradual stages cures him and leads him to the *summum bonum*, removes his last misgivings regarding the justice of God's ways, and reinforces his faith in prayer. It is a solemn conference in a tone of Dantesque earnestness. There is the unfolding of a plot and the forward movement of drama.¹²

The Dialogues are quite different. Here we have a literary revision of stenographers' notes of the actual conversations of a group of historical characters.¹³ There are Augustine himself,

¹⁰ It is an interesting coincidence that both Boethius's first commentary on Porphyry and Augustine's *De Ordine* begin with an unusual night-scene. The speakers in the dialogues have been awakened by night sounds. One has noted that the other is awake, following which the philosophical conversation begins. Cf. Rand, *Founders*, p. 143.

¹¹ See H. F. Stewart, *Boethius an Essay* (1891), pp. 57-80; Klingner, *op. cit.*; Rand, *Founders*, ca. pp. 165-178; E. S. Duckett, *The Gateway to the Middle Ages* (New York, Macmillan, 1938), pp. 197-211.

¹² Cf. Rand, *Founders*, pp. 168, 172.

¹³ Cf. *Ac. I*, i, 4; *B.V. i*, 6; *O. I*, ii, 5 ff., etc.; Rand, *op. cit.*, pp. 256 ff., 342, n. 9.

his two pupils Licentius and Trygetius, his old friend and former student Alypius, his mother Monnica, his natural son Adeodatus, and other close relatives. It is autumn in the year 386 and soon after Augustine's conversion and retirement from teaching. He has retired with his family and friends to the villa of his friend Verecundus at Cassiciacum near Milan. The villa is a pleasant place, not large (Augustine and the boys share the same sleeping quarters) but adequately staffed with *rustici* to do the farm chores. Sometimes Augustine and his pupils go through the motions of work too, but more commonly they make their way through the barnyard to a favorite spot in the fields and read Virgil there or hold debates on philosophic questions. Besides Virgil the boys have Cicero's Hortensius; Licentius reads Ovid as well. Anything noteworthy in their discussions is unfailingly written down by the *notarius* Augustine has brought along into the country. This is the setting of the debates that follow on the possibility of knowledge, the nature of *beata uita*, and the unfinished discussion of providence (finding his hearers unable to follow, Augustine changes the subject). The word *setting* is inadequate, because it suggests a bit of Ciceronian ornament as a preliminary to a formal essay. Augustine's are not like Cicero's dialogues. He writes of real life. There are moments of genuine gaiety and pathos, Licentius and Trygetius (who are brilliantly drawn) quarrel and make up, Augustine himself betrays now and again that he has not yet regained his calm after the emotional strain of the year past, high intercourse is interrupted by prosaic but welcome calls to dinner. So it goes. On one occasion the philosophic group actually stop to watch with critical eye the progress of a cock-fight. There are pleasant pictures of Augustine the exacting yet genial teacher and of Augustine the student making notes and writing away under a tree until it is too dark to see. If the *Consolatio* is metaphysical drama, the Dialogues are domestic drama. The Dialogues lack the movement and steady progression towards a goal that characterize the *Consolatio*. This is a

See also Augustine, *Conf.* (Gibb and Montgomery, Camb. Univ. Press, 1927), pp. lviii-lxiii, 236, 237, 239, 240, 245-247 (i.e. *Conf.* IX, 5, 7, 8, 12-14); Dyroff, *op. cit.*, pp. 21-23.

significant difference, to which I will return later. There is naturally also a wide divergence in topics discussed and the treatment of them.

When allowance has been made for obvious differences between the Dialogues and the Consolatio, there remain significant points of resemblance. Although Augustine is visited by no allegorical Philosophia at Cassiciacum, it is clear from many glowing passages of the Dialogues that while testing the foundations of his belief he too like Boethius is looking anxiously to *divina Philosophia* for solace and guidance. It is in his dramatic references to Philosophy and vivid portrayal of her nature that Augustine most reminds one of Boethius. His expressions have the effect of converting a mere term for the pursuit of wisdom in the abstract into an almost real, if invisible, presence.¹⁴ Like Boethius's austere visitor who is quite frank in her contempt for the *profanum vulgus* and lays great emphasis upon Boethius's profound learning, Augustine's Philosophy is accessible only to the elect. Her teaching is *remota longissime ab intellectu profanorum*¹⁵ and imparted to *veris amatoribus suis*¹⁶ only after a long rigorous schooling.¹⁷ This training will prepare Philosophy's disciple to grasp no small part of what Boethius's Philosophia undertakes to teach. He will be enabled to scale heights and penetrate the great mystery as far as man may (*ultra quod requirere aliquid nec possit nec debeat nec cupiat*). From his vantage-ground he will clearly discern all things and be above the perplexities of common men, who are readily tempted to criticize divine providence.¹⁸ He will be superior to even others, as Augustine says: 'pious and good folk of fine minds, who, while unable to conceive of our being abandoned by Almighty God, are nevertheless so blinded by mortal concerns and distressed by the turmoil of this world that they fail to see the hand of Providence in men's lives. Often these anx-

¹⁴ The concept of Philosophy as healer is, of course, an ancient one. Cf. Zeller, *Phil. der Gr.* (numerous references under 'Philosophie als Heilkunde'). Philosophy has already taken form as an allegorical personage in Cicero (*Tusc.* I, 64; II, 11, 16; III, 13; V, 5). The idea is greatly enriched by Augustine and is most fully exploited by Boethius.

¹⁵ *Cons.* I p 1, etc.; *Ac.* I, 1 (p. 3, 22-23); cf. *Soliloquia* I, 22.

¹⁶ *Ac.* *ibid.*

¹⁷ In addition to I p 1, Boethius's learning is emphasized in I m 2, I p 4, etc. Cf. the course that Augustine lays out for aspiring *eruditi* O. II, 24 ff.

¹⁸ O. II, 14.

ious and misguided souls give utterance to their grievances in verse.' ¹⁹ Such folk would probably compose their poems in the spirit of the exasperated Boethius:

O stelliferi conditor orbis
 Qui perpetuo nixus solio
 Rapido caelum turbine uersas
 Legemque pati sidera cogis
 . . .
 Omnia certo fine gubernans
 Hominum solos respuis actus
 Merito rector cohibere modo.
 Nam cur tantas lubrica uersat
 Fortuna uices? Premit insontes
 Debita sceleri noxia poena,
 At peruersi resident celso
 Mores solio sanctaque calcant
 Iniusta uice colla nocentes.
 Latet obscuris condita uirtus
 Clara tenebris. . . .²⁰

But Philosophy's faithful disciple is promised more: 'When once he has reduced all the truths of all the disciplines to one single Truth, then, with full right to the title of philosopher (*eruditi dignissimus nomine*), he may inquire into Theology and grasp her teaching, no longer to accept it by faith alone but to contemplate it and comprehend it and keep it.' ²¹

The vision that Philosophy promises to unfold to her chosen is ineffable. She herself appeared to Augustine ('with a great awakening light') after his reading the Apostle Paul, as he tells his friend Romanianus:

Perlegi totum intentissime atque castissime. Tunc uero quantulocumque iam lumine adperso tanta se mihi philosophiae facies aperuit, ut non dicam tibi, qui eius incognitae fame semper arsisit.

¹⁹ O. II, 15: alios autem pios et bonos atque splendido ingenio praeditos, qui neque nos deseri a summo deo possunt in animum inducere et tamen rerum tanta quasi caligine atque commixtione turbati nullum ordinem uident uolentesque sibi nudari abditissimas causas errores suos saepe etiam carminibus conqueruntur. I am giving free English paraphrases of some of the passages of Augustine cited in this paper, since they are not entirely clear in the Latin apart from their context. ²⁰ Cons. I m 5.

²¹ O. II, 44: . . . si . . . illa omnia, quae per tot disciplinas late uarieque diffusa sunt, ad unum quiddam simplex uerum certumque redegerit, eruditi dignissimus nomine non temere iam quaerit illa diuina, non iam credenda solum uerum etiam contemplanda intellegenda atque retinenda.

If the vision might only be shared with others, how folk would abandon their worldly pleasures and flock to Philosophy!²²

People generally, however, suffer from the distemper (*communis inlusarum mentium morbus*) that afflicts Boethius in Book I. Like Boethius's eyes, theirs are clouded by the mist of mortal things (*mortalium rerum nube caligantia*).²³ The divine part of man, Augustine writes to Romanianus, must be revived from its lethargy (*uitae huius somno*).²⁴ This is the function of Philosophy. She will restore the sight of those that devote themselves wholly to her. She will heal the soul and lead it to *beata uita*. As Augustine tells Licentius on one occasion, that phrase has a captivating sound to everyone: 'At the very mention of happiness (*beata uita*) people become all attention and, as it were, look at your hands to see whether you have anything to give them plagued as they are by want and disease.' But as soon as it is realized that Philosophy would be their physician, their eagerness wanes. They prefer their malady to her regimen (*monita medici paululum dura et morbis onerosa*).²⁵ Philosophia describes her *remedia acriora* in similar terms to Boethius: *talia sunt quippe, quae restant, ut degustata quidem mordeant, interiorius autem recepta dulcescant*.²⁶ Augustine longs for the day when Philosophy may cure Romanianus's son and his favorite pupil Licentius:

. . . ergo ille, si ueram pulchritudinem, cuius falsae amator est, sanatis renudatisque paululum oculis possit intueri, quanta uoluptate philosophiae gremio se inuolueret!²⁷

But there is a particular difficulty in Licentius's case. He is unfortunately addicted to poetic pursuits.

²² Ac. II, 5-6 (p. 27, 8-12).

²³ Cf. Cons. I p 2, 11 ff., in particular, but Philosophia is constantly occupied in Book I with the problem of Boethius's malady and symptoms.

²⁴ Ac. I, 3 (p. 5, 13).

²⁵ O. I, 24 (p. 137, 2-9): . . . qua nominata [beata uita] omnes sese erigunt et quasi adtendunt in manus, utrum habeas, quod dare possis egentibus uariisque morbis impeditis. Quibus Sapientia [i.e. Philosophy] cum praecipere coeperit, ut medicum perferant seque cum aliqua patientia curari sinant, in pannos suos recidunt, quorum concalescione tabificati scabiem uoluptatum aerumnosarum scalpunt libentius, quam ut monita medici paululum dura et morbis onerosa perpetiundo atque subeundo ualetudini sanorum lucie reddantur.

²⁶ Cons. III p 1, 13-14.

²⁷ Ac. II, 7 (p. 28, 13-16).

Boethius's *Philosophia* makes it clear that the ailing philosopher cannot expect to receive her *remedia ualidiora* as long as he is in a disturbed emotional state.²⁸ In fact, *Philosophia* devotes a good part of Book I to this serious matter of Boethius's emotional perturbation. Until joy, fear, hope, and grief have left his mind, he cannot expect any improvement of his condition:

Nubila mens est
Vinctaque frenis,
Haec ubi regnant.²⁹

Furthermore, nothing serves to promote emotional disorder and thus aggravate the philosopher's malady more than devotion to poetic pursuits. The Muses are doing the worst thing possible for Boethius as *Philosophia* appears. Her sternest words of condemnation are directed to these *scenicae meretriculae*, these sirens that kill the fruits of the mind and make men slaves. The Muses abashed and conscious of guilt slink away.³⁰ The Muses like *Philosophy* are not part of the *dramatis personae* of the Dialogues. Nevertheless their vicious influence is at work at Cassiciacum. Licentius, who is the most likable of the whole little group at Verecundus's villa, is a poet. With a fine mind and considerable powers of expression he has also the makings of a philosopher. He is very much what Augustine must have been at his age.³¹ He joins eagerly in the debates and coöperates with Augustine in all his plans for the rustic seminar, but he cannot give his undivided attention to the philosophic quest, because he is busy with a poem that is to celebrate the tragic case of *Pyramus* and *Thisbe*. Like Augustine's mistresses in the *Confessions*, the Muses are constantly tugging at his sleeve. They take his mind off the themes of *ordo* and *beata uita* and with their elegiacs keep his eyes closed to *uera pulchritudo*. Augustine finds many pretexts for making genially ironic references to Licentius's poetic interests. On one or two occasions he delivers what amounts to a severe scolding. One noon after

²⁸ Cons. I p 5, 38 ff.

²⁹ Cons. I m 7, 29-31.

³⁰ Cons. I p 1, 26-44.

³¹ There is a good characterization of Licentius in Dyroff, op. cit., p. 19. See also Gibb and Montgomery's edition of the *Confessions*, p. lxi, n. 2.

an exciting discussion of the New Academy, while Augustine, Alypius, and the rest are still intent upon the point at issue, Licentius slips away from the luncheon table prematurely to work upon his poem. On this particular day the meetings are being held in the baths on account of bad weather outside. On his way back for the afternoon session, his mind full of devastating arguments to be directed against the thesis of the Academics, Augustine finds Licentius in a corner at work upon his poem. He makes no effort to conceal his disgust: 'I sincerely wish that you may reach the point of embracing that Poesy of yours that you have flirted with so long — not that I particularly admire perfection in poetry, but I perceive that your passions have been so aroused that there will be no escape for you except through satiety. When one has reached perfection in poetry, he usually tires of it readily.'³² At all events, it is better to hear Licentius chanting his own verses than the choruses of Greek tragedies that he does not understand.³³ If he is sensible, however, Licentius will go back, finish his luncheon and have his drink, then return to their school — that is, if he thinks that the school and Philosophy have anything to offer him:

admoneo tamen ut pergas potum, si uoles, et ad scholam redeas nostram, si tamen aliquid iam de te Hortensius et philosophia meretur, cui dulcissimas primitias iam uestro illo sermone libasti, qui te uehementius quam ista poetica incenderat ad magnarum et uere fructuosarum rerum scientiam.³⁴

Had Augustine continued and used the words of Boethius's own *Philosophia*, *ista poetica sunt quae infructuosis affectuum spinis uberem fructibus rationis segetem necant hominumque mentes assuefaciunt morbo non liberant*,³⁵ it would have surprised no one. It seems almost as if the towering figure of *Philosophia* were looking down upon the sheepish Licentius *toruis inflammata luminibus*.³⁶ Augustine is not quite sure

³² Ac. III, 7 (p. 50, 17–21): Opto quidem, inquam, tibi, ut istam poeticam, quam concupisti, conplectaris aliquando, non quod me nimis delectat ista perfectio, sed quod uideo te tantum exarsisse, ut nisi fastidio euadere ab hoc amore non possis, quod euenire post perfectionem facile solet.

³³ Ibid. (p. 50, 21–24).

³⁴ Ibid. (p. 50, 24–28).

³⁵ Cons. I p 1, 32–34.

³⁶ Ibid. 28.

whether it may not be a mistake to try to make anything more out of Licentius than a *profanus*. Poor Licentius, like the banished Muses, hangs his head in shame and hurries away: *Erubuit ille discessitque, ut biberet, nam et multum sitiebat et occasio dabatur euitandi me plura fortasse atque asperiora dicturum.*³⁷

On another occasion when Licentius is humming his verses in Augustine's hearing (*cantando et ululando*) and much to his annoyance, Augustine warns him that poetry is erecting between him and truth a wall thicker than that separating his Pyramus and Thisbe. They, at least, were able to sigh through a crack to each other.³⁸ Licentius's case, however, is not entirely desperate. He will soon be recounting the tragic death of his lovers. Right then and there will come his golden opportunity. In the very midst of the pathos in which his poem must abound, let him banish from his soul forever the curse of foul desire and raise his voice in praise of that undefiled love by which souls disciplined by the arts are joined to pure Mind by Philosophy and not only shun death but attain perfect happiness. These are Augustine's words:

'Vade ergo interim ad illas Musas. Verum tamen scis, quid te facere uelim?' 'Iube,' ait [Licentius], 'quod placet.' 'Ubi se,' inquam, 'Pyramus et illa eius super inuicem, ut cantaturus es, interemerint, in dolore ipso, quo tuum carmen uehementius inflammari decet, habes commodissimam opportunitatem. Arripe illius foedae libidinis et incendiorum uenenatorum execrationem, quibus miseranda illa contingunt, deinde totus ad tollere in laudem puri et sinceri amoris, quo animae doctae disciplinis et uirtute formonsae copulantur intellectui per philosophiam et non solum mortem fugiunt uerum etiam uita beatissima perfruuntur.' His ille tacitus ac diu consideratione nutans motato capite abscessit.³⁹

It is not fair to Licentius to recount merely a series of incidents in which he serves as a convenient target for Augustine's hostility to emotionalism in poetry. He is much more than a moody young poet and does eventually come to appreciate *uera pulchritudo*. Augustine tells how Licentius's eyes were opened one night as he and Trygetius and Augustine were lying awake trying to account for an irregular sound made by the

³⁷ Ac. III, 7 (p. 50, 29-51, 4).

³⁸ O. I, 8 (p. 126, 20-26).

³⁹ O. I, 24 (p. 137, 13-24). In his *Retractationes* (I, 3), Augustine regrets that he ever referred to the Muses even in jest as *aliquas deas*.

water outside their window.⁴⁰ Talk turned to the question of providence. In the face of ridicule from Trygetius Licentius makes an impassioned defense of the thesis *nihil praeter ordinem fieri posse*.⁴¹ As the result of Augustine's daily teaching he feels that he has seen the truth at last and fears to have the vision disturbed. Augustine is delighted and cries, 'Let Licentius follow whither the god leads!' He hastens to add that he does not refer to Apollo but to Truth:

sed alius profecto est, alius ille altus ueridicus atque ipsa — quid enim uerbis ambiam? — ueritas, cuius uates sunt, quicumque possunt esse sapientes. Ergo adgrediemur, Licenti; freti pietate cultores uestigiis nostris ignem perniciosum fumosarum cupiditatum opprimamus.⁴²

Licentius shall become Truth's poet and stamp out the fire of passion. It almost seems as if Philosophia again stood by and, having routed the profane Muses, urged Licentius to quit the sirens and listen to her song instead (*meisque eum Musis curandum sanandumque relinquit*).⁴³

Klingner in his study of the *Consolatio* hesitated to point to any source from which Boethius might have derived the episode of the Muses' banishment.⁴⁴ Is it necessary to return far into the past in searching for his model?⁴⁵ May not Augustine's attitude towards poetry in the *Dialogues* and the lively scenes in which Licentius receives reprimand and admonition have been in the back of Boethius's mind as he wrote and have had something to do with the shaping of the incident?⁴⁶

⁴⁰ O. I, 6 ff. This whole scene is a piece of brilliant realistic writing.

⁴¹ O. I, 8-9.

⁴² O. I, 10 (p. 127, 21-128, 17).

⁴³ Cons. I p 1, 39-41.

⁴⁴ Op. cit., p. 115, n. 2. Klingner cited *Catalepton V*, in which the Muses although banished are invited to return *sed pudenter et raro*. Cf. E. K. Rand, *Les Esprits Souverains dans la Littérature Romaine* (Paris, 1936), p. 68.

⁴⁵ On the ancient hostility of Philosophy towards the poets, cf. Weinberger's edition of the *Consolatio* (CSEL LXVII, 1934), p. 3. Cf. also Cic. *Tusc.* II, 27; III, 3.

⁴⁶ In addition to Plato's and Cicero's animosity toward the poets, Boethius would naturally have been familiar with Augustine's grievance against the poets often expressed in his other works, e.g. *Conf.* I, 25-26; *De C. D.* II, 14, etc. The *Dialogues*, however, present Philosophy's grievance in a series of animated and colorful passages; these, it seems to me, were the most likely to come to Boethius's mind as he wrote the first part of the *Consolatio*.

The Dialogues and the Consolatio are in agreement upon another fundamental matter relating to Philosophy and her cult. Both works emphasize the precious nature of the opportunity offered by adversity, especially adversity that is sudden in its coming and devastating. Such misfortune is a priceless blessing, for nothing else so draws men to Philosophy and makes them responsive to her teaching. In fact, experience of misfortune is virtually a first requirement of Philosophy's disciples.

This is the very starting-point of the Consolatio. It is implied that Boethius's contentment with his lot and his self-imposed exile from the *ciuitas Philosophiae* might have been of indefinite duration, perhaps permanent, if sudden misfortune had not shattered his false felicity. Without this blow of Fortune, Boethius might never have returned to his nurse Philosophy or have consented to receive treatment for his malady. He would never, the Consolatio implies, have been likely to make the critical examination of Fortune's gifts that he makes with the aid of Philosophy and which leads him to discover the nature of true happiness.

Augustine gives great prominence to the blessings of adversity in the prefaces to *Contra Academicos* and *De Beata Vita*. Misfortune is thought of as virtually the only agency that can turn men's minds to Philosophy or bring back her prodigal sons. God or Nature or Necessity, he says, has hurled us into Fortune's sea. Few would ever know where to set their course and few would ever reach the *portus philosophiae*, if it were not for *Fortuna aduersa*:

Cum enim in hunc mundum siue deus siue natura siue necessitas siue uoluntas nostra . . . uelut in quoddam procellosum salum nos quasi temere passimque proiecerit, quotusquisque cognosceret, quo sibi nitendum esset quauē redeundum, nisi aliquando et inuitos contraque obnitentes aliqua tempestas, quae stultis uidetur aduersa, in optatissimam terram nescientes errantesque conpingeret? ⁴⁷

Some folk make hardly any voyage at all upon the treacherous sea of Fortune,⁴⁸ hurrying back to port and raising storm-

⁴⁷ B.V. I, 1.

⁴⁸ Cf. Cons. I p 3, 38; I m 5, 45.

warnings for others. It is different with most of the mariners. Mistaking the weather-signs they sail gaily out of sight of land:

. . . qui fallacissima facie maris decepti elegerunt in medium progredi longaque a sua patria peregrinari audent et eius saepe obliuiscuntur. Hos si nescio quo et nimis latente modo a puppi uentus, quem prosperum putant, fuerit persecutus, penetrant in altissima miseriarum elati atque gaudentes, quod eis usque quaque fallacissima serenitas uoluptatum honorumque blanditur.⁴⁹

For souls of this sort, disaster (*lacrimabiles tragoediae fortune suarum*) or, at least, distress (*uel inanium negotiorum anxiae difficultates*) brings salvation, for they are driven to take refuge in books of wisdom and thereby, as it were, wake up in port never to be enticed to sea again.⁵⁰ Boethius was destined to think of himself as a wanderer of this sort, or, at least, to represent himself so for the dramatic purposes of the *Consolatio*.⁵¹ Another philosophic voyager, saved from spiritual ruin by the blessing of adversity, was Licentius's father and Augustine's benefactor Romanianus.⁵² The prefaces to the first two books of *Contra Academicos* are addressed to him. Disaster of some sort, so it appears from the prefaces, has overtaken the affluent Romanianus, not utter ruin but some *anxia difficultas*. To comfort him Augustine would direct his mind to philosophy. There is much in the picture Augustine gives of Romanianus's plight and in the solace that he offers him that is 'Boethian' in tone.

While Augustine does not administer to Romanianus full *philosophica consolatio*, he does endeavor to prepare him for it. Augustine proceeds, like Boethius's *Philosophia*, to offer a *remedium lenius* or *paulo acrius*. He congratulates Romanianus on the adversity that brings him to the *portus philosophiae*.

⁴⁹ B.V. i, 2 (p. 89, 15-26).

⁵⁰ Ibid. (p. 90, 4-9).

⁵¹ A mediaeval commentator on I m 1 grasped the dramatic character of the *Cons.*: *Hoc non dicit pro se Boetius sed pro illis qui dolent de amissione mundanarum rerum*. See *Saeculi Noni Auct. in Boetii Cons. Ph. comm.* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, IX, 1935), p. 8, 12-14.

⁵² There are, in addition to the prefaces to *Contra Ac.*, numerous passages in Augustine's *Conf.* and letters relating to Romanianus. See the references in the article of H. W. Phillott, *Dict. of Chr. Biog.* IV (1887), 550-551. Augustine's *De Vera Religione* is addressed to Romanianus.

He prays that he may be restored to himself and true freedom.⁵³ Then Philosophy will reveal to him, as to her other true disciples, the mysteries of providence, Fortune and *casus*. He will learn that the latter are merely the outward manifestations of unseen providence.⁵⁴ Prosperity had almost completed Romanianus's downfall when the blast of *Fortuna aduersa* rescued him (*paene mergentem*). If he had been allowed to continue a career of increasing power and affluence, no one would have had the courage to suggest that he was not truly *beatus*:

An uero si edentem te munera ursorum et numquam ibi antea uisa spectacula ciuibus nostris theatricus plausus semper prosperrimus accepisset, si stultorum hominum, quorum immensa turba est, conflatis et consentientibus uocibus ferreris ad caelum, si . . . conlocarentur statuæ, influerent honores, adderentur etiam potestates . . . tu interea uiueres in aedificiorum exquisitissimis molibus, in nitore balnearum, in tesseris, quas honestas non respuit, in uenatibus, in conuiujs, in ore clientium, in ore ciuium, in ore denique populorum humanissimus liberalissimus mundissimus fortunatissimus *iacteris*, quisquam tibi, Romaniane, beatae alterius uitae, quae sola beata est, quisquam quaeso mentionem facere auderet? quisquam tibi persuadere posset non solum te felicem non esse sed eo maxime miserum, quo tibi minime uidereris? ⁵⁵

Now Fortune has struck and it is not necessary to remind Romanianus, for he is an object-lesson to others.⁵⁶ If Romanianus had been a poet like his son, he might have turned upon his clients and friends with words like those of Boethius:

Quid me felicem totiens iactastis amici?
Qui cecidit, stabili non erat ille gradu.⁵⁷

Augustine promises Romanianus that he is to awaken from his dream of this world; his sufferings have been given him expressly to rouse his soul from its lethargy:

Illud ergo, illud tuum . . . illud ipsum, inquam, quod in te diuinum nescio quo uitae huius somno ueternoque sopitum est, uariis illis durisque iactionibus secreta prouidentia excitare decreuit.

⁵³ An indispensable first step in the progress towards Philosophy's cure. Cf. Cons. I p 6, 33-42; O. I, 3.

⁵⁴ Ac. I, 1 (p. 3, 17-4, 4).

⁵⁵ Ac. I, 1-2 (p. 4, 4-5, 3). The italics are mine.

⁵⁶ Ibid. 2 (p. 5, 7).

⁵⁷ Cons. I m 1, 21-22.

Augustine too had been nearly ruined by success before illness drove him to the bosom of Philosophy, who is now nursing him back to health (*ipsa me nunc in otio, quod uehementer optauimus, nutrit ac fouet*). Philosophy is teaching him complete contempt for the world of sense (*contemni oportere, quidquid mortalibus oculis cernitur, quidquid ullus sensus attingit*). Before long she will reveal to him the beatific vision itself:

*Ipsa uerissimum et secretissimum deum perspicue se demonstraturam promittit et iam iamque quasi per lucidas nubes ostentare dignatur.*⁵⁸

The dejected Romanianus is scarcely in a position to receive Philosophy's benefits yet; but to encourage him and give him, as it were, a foretaste of philosophy, Augustine is sending him this dialogue (*Contra Academicos*) in which his own son is one of the speakers.⁵⁹

The resemblance between Augustine's Dialogues and the *Consolatio Philosophiae* ends with the attributes of Philosophy, her requirements of her votaries, the malady that commonly afflicts her disciples, the vicious influence of the Muses in aggravating that malady, the inestimable blessings of sudden adversity that drives men to seek comfort in Philosophy, and the promise of Philosophy that she will lead the initiate ultimately to *beata uita*. The parallel extends no farther, for in spite of the unending search for truth, the expectancy and flashes of revelation, of which the Dialogues tell, no one is actually healed by Philosophy or guided to *beata uita* there, although Philosophy's promise is clear. Augustine himself admits that he has made little progress; he is still riding at anchor *in portu philosophiae*:

*Ergo uides, in qua philosophia quasi in portu nauigem. Sed etiam ipse late patet; eius magnitudo quamuis iam minus periculosum non tamen penitus excludit errorem. Nam cui parti terrae, quae profecto una beata est, me ad-moueam eamque contingam, prorsus ignoro. Quid enim solidum tenui, cui adhuc de anima quaestio nutat et fluctuat?*⁶⁰

⁵⁸ Ac. I, 3.

⁵⁹ Ac. I, 4. Boethius in his exile had good reason to recall Augustine's discourse to Romanianus on the uses of adversity. It is tempting to imagine that this recollection brought with it other reminiscences of the Dialogues and started the train of thought out of which the *Consolatio* grew.

⁶⁰ B.V. II, 5.

As it has already been said, the situation in the *Consolatio* is different. There is gradual but steady movement and unswerving progress towards the goal. As the work begins, it is true, the *nebulae tristitiae* hang just as low as often at Cassiciacum, but *Philosophia* emerges from the cloud, majestically performs her function of healer, exactly charts the course of the journey and completes it. The promise held out to Licentius and Romanianus is triumphantly fulfilled. Boethius's *Consolatio Philosophiae* is, in effect, a sequel to the *Dialogues*. I cannot help conjecturing that the *Dialogues* suggested the project; Boethius executed it.

This translation into what might be called dramatic form of an idea foreshadowed in the *Dialogues* was a brilliant procedure on the part of Boethius. In the doing of this he may have received a further hint from Augustine himself, that is from the *Soliloquia*. In the *Founders of the Middle Ages*, Professor Rand remarks (following a description of our *Dialogues* and other works of Augustine): 'There is also the *Soliloquium*, really not a soliloquy, but a dialogue between Augustine and his Reason, a device that reappears, in a more elaborate and picturesque form, in the *Consolation of Philosophy* of Boethius. The subject of the *Soliloquium* is the problem of cognition, the possibility of knowing, the nature of the real and the false.'⁶¹ It is immediately apparent from this brief characterization that the questions at issue in the *Soliloquia* are not precisely those that occupy *Philosophia* and Boethius. It is equally apparent that the *Soliloquia* and the *Consolatio* have one interesting feature in common, their form.

There are two speakers and no more: Ratio and Augustinus. Augustine has chosen this unusual form of dialogue for several reasons. He is free from the embarrassments and disadvantages of formal debate with a group. He finds it also the swiftest road to truth:

Cum enim neque melius quaeri ueritas possit, quam interrogando et respondendo, et uix quisquam inueniatur quem non pudeat conuinci disputantem, eoque paene semper eueniat ut rem bene inductam ad discutiendum inconditus peruiaciae clamor explodat, etiam cum laceratione animorum, plerumque

⁶¹ P. 257.

dissimulata, interdum et aperta; pacatissime, ut opinor, et commodissime placuit, a meipso interrogatum mihique respondentem, Deo adiuuante, uerum quaerere. . . .⁶²

These same qualities of the *soliloquium* may have led Boethius to adopt the form in place of the more elaborate Platonic or the Ciceronian form of dialogue, that he might otherwise have used. Boethius may have had other models in mind, but it seems likely to me that he borrowed the idea from Augustine. The latter indicates in a passage that precedes the one just quoted that the whole idea is a new one:

A. Non habeo quid dicam, et pudet me tam temerariae consensionis meae superioris.

R. Ridiculum est si te pudet, quasi non ob idipsum elegerimus huiusmodi sermocinationes: quae quoniam cum solis nobis loquimur, Soliloquia uocari et inscribi uolo; nouo quidem et fortasse duro nomine, set ad rem demonstrandam satis idoneo.⁶³

Boethius does, indeed, make his work more picturesque and elaborate by pouring it into the mould of the so-called Menippean satire. His speakers conduct their conference in elegant prose but ever and anon break into song.

The *Consolatio* and the *Soliloquia* not only record a conference but tell of the same sort of conference. It is apparent that Augustinus is a patient and that Ratio is his physician. Augustinus's malady in part, at least, resembles that of the ailing Boethius. His vision is clouded by mortal shadows, he is held fast by earthly longings, and he is tossed by passion. Ratio is almost as circumstantial as Boethius's *Philosophia* in the diagnosis and description of Augustinus's *morbis*.⁶⁴ Ratio and Augustinus have many a chat on the state of the discussion and the method of conducting it.⁶⁵ Most important of all, Ratio and Augustinus are making a journey towards the *summum bonum*, towards truth, light and the knowledge of God. The journey is long and difficult. Augustinus often asks for some sign that they have been making progress. He bursts into tears

⁶² Sol. II, 14.

⁶³ Sol. II, 13-14.

⁶⁴ Cf. Sol. I, 12, 16, 17, 26, 27.

⁶⁵ Sol. II, 13 (end)-14.

and Ratio comforts him. The following is a characteristic passage from the end of the first book of the Soliloquia:

A. Tace, obsecro, tace. Quid crucias? quid tantum fodis alteque descendis? Iam flere non duro, iamiam nihil promitto, nihil praesumo, ne me de istis rebus interroges. Certe dicis quod ille ipse quem uidere ardeo, nouerit quando sim sanus; faciat quod placet: quando placet sese ostendat; iam me totum eius clementiae curaeque committo. Semel de illo credidi quod sic erga se affectos subleuare non cesset. Ego nihil de mea sanitate, nisi cum illam pulchritudinem uidero, pronuntiabo.

R. Prorsus nihil aliud facias. Sed iam cohibe te a lacrimis, et stringe animum. Multum omnino fleuisti, et hoc omnino morbus iste pectoris tui grauius accipit.

A. Modum uis habere lacrimas meas, cum miseriae meae modum non uideam? aut ualetudinem corporis considerare me iubes, cum ego ipse tabe confectus sim? Sed, quaeso te, si quid in me uales, ut me tentes per aliqua compendia ducere, ut uel uicinitate nonnulla lucis illius, quam, si quid profeci, tolerare iam possum, pigeat oculos referre ad illas tenebras, quas reliqui; si tamen relictæ dicendæ sunt, quæ caecitati meae adhuc blandiri audent.⁶⁶

There is unmistakably present in the Soliloquia a fundamental Augustinian motif that has been called 'l'itinéraire de l'âme à Dieu.'⁶⁷ It has been pointed out that the Consolatio represents 'l'itinéraire d'un esprit vers Dieu par les voies de la philosophie.'⁶⁸ It is significant that in the Soliloquia and in the Consolatio the ailing soul is not called upon to make the journey alone but is in the hands of a competent philosophical physician and guide.

There is one further interesting correspondence between the Soliloquia and the Consolatio. Since both recount the story of a conference with a supernatural visitor, something is needed to set the stage. Such august personages do not appear casually without introduction. Boethius's Philosophia makes a dramatic entrance and keeps the dismayed philosopher in a state of suspense until at the beginning of the third prose he comes to himself and recognizes her. Philosophia's appearance has reminded some of supernatural revelations such as occur in

⁶⁶ I, 26. This passage is not entirely representative, because it gives no idea of the liveliness of many of Ratio's and Augustinus's disputes.

⁶⁷ See Etienne Gilson, *Introduction à l'étude de Saint Augustin* (Paris, 1929), pp. 12-29, cited by Carton, *op. cit.*, pp. 641.

⁶⁸ Carton, *ibid.*

apocalyptic literature like the Shepherd of Hermas and Hermes Trismegistus's Poimandres.⁶⁹ The Soliloquia cannot compare with the other works in the elaborateness with which this motif is handled, but the idea is there. Ratio is ushered in with a due air of mystery and Augustinus is properly puzzled regarding her:

Voluenti mihi multa ac uaria mecum diu, ac per multos dies sedulo quaerenti memetipsum ac bonum meum, quidue mali euitandum esset; ait mihi subito, siue ego ipse, siue alius quis extrinsecus, siue intrinsecus, nescio: nam hoc ipsum est quod magnopere scire molior: ait ergo mihi. . . .⁷⁰

This is the last of the parallels between Augustine and Boethius that I have noted, but the subject has not, perhaps, been exhausted.⁷¹

I cannot prove that Boethius in the days of his exile and distress recalled the Dialogues and Soliloquia and was inspired by them, although I feel strongly that such was very probably the case. The Dialogues presented a rich characterization of Philosophy and hinted at the possibility of a sequel, in which Philosophy might be seen in action. The Soliloquia suggested a form for the sequel to take. Boethius's circle not only knew

⁶⁹ Klingner, *op. cit.*, pp. 113 ff.; Rand, *Founders*, p. 161.

⁷⁰ Sol. I, 1.

⁷¹ One passage of the Soliloquia (I, 24) may have provided Boethius with the theme of IV m 1. In both Augustine and the Cons. the divine interlocutor has just promised to point out the road to the goal. There is the same insistence upon the need of abandoning the concerns of earth, for this is a *flight* towards Light (*lux illa, lumen uerendum*). Cf. their words: Aug.: *Penitus esse ista sensibilia fugienda cavendumque magnopere, dum hoc corpus agimus, ne quo eorum uisco pennae nostrae impediuntur, quibus integris perfectisque opus est, ut ad illam lucem ab his tenebris euolemus. . . .* Boethius:

Sunt etenim pennae uolucres mihi
 Quae celsa consendant poli.
 Quas sibi cum uelox mens induit,
 Terras perosa despicit . . .

 Polum relinquat extimum
 Dorsaque uelocis premat aetheris
 Compos uerendi luminis . . .

Both Ratio and Philosophia promise that as soon as the goal is reached the winged soul will recognize at once the success of his journey. Both Augustinus and Boethius (beginning of p. 2) sigh wistfully. Neither is yet ready to make the flight.

Augustine but knew the Dialogues as well as his later work.⁷² They no doubt grasped Boethius's purpose and relished this particular blossoming of *semina ex beati Augustini scriptis*.⁷³

There can be no harm in adding a final speculation. Augustine's little works must have led many to philosophy in later days. It is tempting to imagine that they may have drawn Boethius to Philosophy as Cicero's Hortensius had led Augustine.

⁷² Augustine's Dialogues were to be found in Cassiodorus's library at Vivarium. Cf. the references in R. A. B. Mynors's edition of the *Institutiones* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1937), p. 187.

⁷³ Boethius, *De Tr.* (Stewart and Rand), p. 4, 31-32.

THE INFLUENCE OF EMERSON'S DIVINITY SCHOOL ADDRESS

D. ELTON TRUEBLOOD

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

THOMAS CARLYLE never visited American shores. There was much to encourage his coming, especially the argument dear to his Scottish heart of money to be earned by lecturing. His friend Emerson, whose efforts made Sartor Resartus appreciated in America earlier than in England, was ready both to entertain him at Concord and to introduce him to the paying public. Once Emerson wrote to Carlyle a letter of invitation, describing his life at Concord so charmingly that the invitation must have been hard to decline. Carlyle was touched at one of his most tender points when his correspondent suggested that the hardy Scot's destiny lay in a new world. "What have you to do with Italy?" Emerson asked. "Your genius tendeth to the New, to the West." Carlyle was invited to try New England for a year, with the promise of new health for poor Jane. The conclusion of Emerson's postscript made the mock assumption of real expectation. "Shall we have anthracite coal or wood in your chamber? My old mother is glad you are coming."

This wonderfully cordial letter was dated the tenth of May, 1838, and the invitation was repeated, especially on the sixth of August of the same year. "But I am asked continually," he wrote then, "When you will come to Boston. Your lectures are boldly and joyfully expected by brave young men." By the seventh of October, however, Emerson was advising against a visit, advising against it at a time when the chance of Carlyle's coming seemed greatest. Emerson repeated his desire to see Carlyle in America, said he still believed the visit would come to pass, but urged against it in 1838. The reason he gave was the publication of his Divinity School Address and the consequent trouble. "At this moment I would not have you here on any account," Emerson wrote. The leading newspapers had made an outcry against Emerson's teachings as expressed in the Address and had warned readers against all of

Emerson's connections, including Carlyle. "I am heartily sorry," continued Emerson, "to see this last aspect of the storm in our washbowl." If Carlyle were ever to come to America, he should come, his friend thought, with no extra burdens upon his reputation and no undeserved barriers to overcome. Did the Divinity School Address, which so long barred Emerson from Harvard, also bar Carlyle from America?

I

As we observe the manner in which the Divinity School Address was received a century ago we are struck especially by two facts: first, its publication rather than its delivery was the occasion of the public storm, and, second, its influence was felt more strongly by men in early maturity than by the students to whom it was originally directed.

That the actual delivery made little stir is evident when we realize that news of Emerson's heresy did not travel to Dartmouth to hinder his lecture there later in the same month, and, furthermore, that Emerson went on urging the Carlyle visit after July, though he changed abruptly in the autumn.

Emerson's own recognition of the full fury of the washbowl storm developed slowly. When he wrote to Carlyle early in August, the Address had already been delivered three weeks, but he still pressed his invitation for the trans-Atlantic visit. At that time he wrote,

I have written and read a kind of sermon to the Senior Class of our Cambridge Theological School a fortnight ago; and an address to the Literary Societies of Dartmouth College; for though I hate American pleniloquence, I cannot easily say No to young men who bid me speak also. And both these are now in press. The first I hear is very offensive. I will now try to hold my tongue until next winter.

In the paragraph following this Emerson repeated the invitation which, after the publication of the Address, he was to postpone indefinitely.

Not one of the seven members of the graduating class of the school in 1838 attained real eminence, and the two who were best known for their writings adopted positions alien to that of Emerson, one becoming a Swedenborgian and the other an

Episcopalian. The latter became a strong churchman and a vigorous believer in miracles. The former, we are surprised to discover, did not even bother to stay for the graduating address, but spent the week-end at East Bridgewater. On this same week-end the young man became really interested in Swedenborg for the first time, though he had already taken one of Swedenborg's books from the college library at Emerson's suggestion. It was the men a bit older who were most excited about the Address. Theodore Parker, for example, having been ordained a few days before, called it a "Sermon on the Mount."

Though Emerson called the discussion aroused by his Divinity School Address a "storm in our washbowl," it is easy to see now that the author underestimated the event. Whether it actually deterred a visit from Carlyle we cannot know, but we do know that it marked a turning point in American life and letters. The Address consolidated forces, drew lines, and served to make a group of younger men highly self-conscious. It was these same young men who started *The Dial* in July, 1840, twenty-four months after the famous Address was delivered. The new journal, which included so much from the pens of Emerson, Ripley, and others whom the Divinity Address had affected directly, was started in the confident belief that a new spirit had made its appearance in New England. The conviction that there was a new spirit ultimately inspired with new vigor a number of young men who now stand as characteristic expressions of nineteenth century America.

In Emerson's opening and unsigned statement to the reader in Volume I, Number I of *The Dial*, mention was made of the new spirit. The editors were not, he said, instigators of a fresh venture, but rather the obedient instruments of a wave of conviction.

In that respect, they have obeyed, though with great joy, the strong current of thought and feeling, which, for a few years past, has led many sincere persons in New England to make new demands on literature, and to reprobate that rigor of our conventions of religion and education which is turning us to stone, which renounces hope, which looks only backward, which asks only such a future as the past, which suspects improvement, and holds nothing so much in horror as new views and the dreams of youth.'

The belief that a new spirit had come, fit for a new age, was generally shared in the period. The exuberant spirit of 1838 is illustrated by an unsigned article in Volume I of the *Boston Quarterly Review* (January, 1838), in which the young men are reminded of "the greatness and the sanctity of our mission." Thus George Ripley, in his "Letter to a Theological Student," brought his advice to a climax by reference to the springtime of the soul which was making its appearance.

In Europe a new life has sprung up from the ashes of a departed faith; a hag-like, scholastic theology has given up the ghost, upon being brought out of darkness into daylight; and a virgin form appears radiant with beauty, and already uttering the same words with which angel voices heralded the birth of Christ. It is for our young men to welcome this glorious visitant to their bosoms. It is for them to naturalize a truly liberal and generous theology on our own blessed soil.

There was confident talk of this new spirit before 1838, as in Ripley's letter, and there was talk of it after 1838, but the middle of that year was significant because it witnessed an Address which told what the new spirit was. Emerson's Divinity School Address was important because it was quickly recognized as the charter of the new movement.

II

Is there another modern instance of a speech so famous given in so small an auditorium? Divinity Hall is known by name to thousands who have never seen its unostentatious brick walls, and it is known primarily because of what a young man said there a hundred years ago. Divinity Hall is not a large building as a whole, and the part of it set aside for a chapel is especially tiny. The building stands on Divinity Avenue, in Cambridge, precisely opposite the great bulk of the Museum of Natural History. Twenty-three years ago, Francis G. Peabody saw the domination of the old Hall by the structure devoted to science as symptomatic of the predicament of theological study in our century. "Like the studies which it was built to foster," he said, "Divinity Hall has become beset on every side by the monuments of neighboring sciences." Professor

Peabody did not know how wonderfully prophetic his words were. With the building of the towering zoölogical laboratories to the east, the scientific transformation of the Divinity Library on the north, and the construction of the Geographical Institute building farther south on Divinity Avenue, Professor Peabody's figure of speech has become the literal truth. When we look at the Tercentenary Map of Harvard, it takes sharp eyes to locate the building for which Divinity Avenue is named. The simple colonial structure, once considered the finest example of academic architecture in the entire university, and known as the scene of occasions on which great words were spoken, stands modestly but securely between the great piles devoted to another kind of learning, a symbol of the fact that our culture has not been entirely secularized. The zoölogical quadrangle still has divinity represented near the focal point.

The chapel of Divinity Hall is on the second floor of this small building, on the side next to the street. The room, though rich in memories, is entirely devoid of decoration in the ordinary sense, and cannot hold more than a few dozen at best. Here on Sunday evening, July 15, a century ago, there assembled probably six members of the senior class, their teachers, a few of their friends and the thirty-five year old man whom they had chosen as their speaker.

When Emerson appeared on this particular evening of that "refulgent summer," he was already a person of some public importance, sufficient to warrant both the expectant enthusiasm of the graduates and the watchful anxiety of their sober instructors. His essay on Milton had just appeared in the July number of the *North American Review*; he was obviously beginning to be a person of consequence. He was himself a graduate of the School, though his training in it had been neither thorough nor conventional, and his resignation from the pastorate of the Second Church of Boston was well known. His small book, *Nature*, though few copies had been purchased, had been available to the public for almost two years. The event of major importance in Emerson's career up to this time, however, had been his selection, almost a year earlier, as the Phi Beta Kappa orator in the meeting-house of the First Parish

of Cambridge. The setting of the 1837 address has been recreated for us by a former editor of *The Atlantic Monthly*, who has called it "Emerson's Most Famous Speech." Bliss Perry has told us of the young men who heard Emerson and who went out with a new zeal for the production of an indigenous American literature. The gospel of national self-reliance was attractively phrased, with a conviction which is still transparent after the lapse of so many years.

We will walk on our own feet; we will work with our own hands; we will speak our own minds. . . . A nation of men will for the first time exist, because each believes himself inspired by the Divine Soul which also inspires all men.

It is easy to see that many of those who listened on August 31, 1837 were convinced that great things were transpiring in the spiritual life of men, and that a new burst was evident. The young men were aroused by an intoxicating new doctrine which revolved around the sacredness of each individual soul. Since the "Transcendental Club" had been growing for almost a year when the Phi Beta Kappa Address was given, a few alert souls were quick to see in it the rallying cry of a new movement. The alert souls included foes as well as friends, and sympathizers; conspicuous among the former being Professor Henry Ware, Jr., who had had ample opportunity to be acquainted with Emerson's ideas. It was this same Henry Ware, Jr. who had been the minister of the Second Church of Boston when the youthful Emerson was installed as associate minister. It was he who had witnessed the growing conflict between Emerson and the Second Church, resulting in Emerson's resignation and the acceptance of the resignation.

The Phi Beta Kappa Address drew little fire from those who were bound to oppose what they considered a new fad, because the address in the meeting-house dealt broadly with American culture and did not enter specifically the field of religious thought. Both friends and foes, however, were watching eagerly to see what would happen when the religious aspect of the new gospel was preached. There is a justifiable difference of opinion concerning which of the two speeches was the more famous, Dr. George A. Gordon differing from Professor Perry

in giving preference to the Divinity School Address in this regard, but in any case there is hardly a third competitor. Inasmuch as New England culture was based so largely on religious foundations the religious statement was the critical one. In the Divinity School Address Emerson, arrived at maturity, had his opportunity to state the new faith.

III

As we read the Address today it is hard to see why it could have been so exciting, either to friends or foes. The argument of the Address, shorn of its rhetorical phrases and reduced to sober prose is as follows:

The external world of nature is beautiful, but the inner world, particularly that of moral experience is more beautiful still. This inner world has its laws, as the outer world has its laws. The moral sentiment is reverence for the laws of the soul. The harmony of these laws suggests a primal Unity which is Good, and from which all else proceeds. This unity is the law of laws, and the perception of it gives the religious sentiment. Thus full recognition of moral laws is the essence of all religion, being something which dignifies and even deifies man. Since religion is a direct intuition of what lies deeper than sense it can never be received at second hand.

Religion, as currently taught, does not reach this high level, but is a debased form. While it talks about Jesus Christ it misses his spirit. The chief defects of historical Christianity are two: first, it exaggerates the personal as against the doctrine of the soul, and, second, it acts as though inspiration had ceased centuries ago, whereas it should be a continuous present reality.

The remedy lies in a sense of the dignity of man as man, a rejection of all secondary knowledge, and the individual self-reliance which will never stoop to imitation, even of the great models. We must study more fully the laws of virtue and we must plumb the depths of our own souls in which there are resources on which we have not yet drawn. The highest revelation of the laws of the inner life is one still beyond us, in the future.

So stated the Address is neither thrilling nor shocking. But Emerson did not write the Address in sober prose — instead he introduced poetic touches which are responsible in large part for its reception, since these poetic touches gave watchwords to the enthusiasts and provided the critics with convenient clues to the author's loose thinking. Some of the watchwords are still sufficiently moving to make us understand something of what the eager listeners felt. What must have been the

emotions of those already in revolt against dead tradition, when they heard such expressions as the following?

Yourself a newborn bard of the Holy Ghost, cast behind you all conformity, and acquaint men at first hand with Deity.

O my friends, there are resources in us on which we have not drawn.

This sentiment is divine and deifying. It is the beatitude of man. It makes him illimitable.

Statements like these achieve their striking effect by being overstatements, but the same overstatements were offensive to the accepted leaders. If Emerson had contented himself with the assertions that men possess un-used powers and that we should expect first hand communion with God in the present, and if, furthermore, he had presented these convictions in a careful, precise form, his critics would not have pounced upon the Address, but it is also true that, in that case, we should have no interest in it now.

It is clear that the chief critics, who were men of no mean intellectual stature, thought that Emerson had taken advantage of the situation which his invitation provided. He had come in an apparently friendly manner, but, once arrived in the citadel, had used the occasion to express the frothy new doctrines and thus forever associate the good name of Harvard with these same doctrines. In a school devoted to training leaders of the churches, he denounced in wholesale manner the existing Christian Church as though it were all of a piece and as though he did not recognize the presence of many inside it who were as eager as he could be to make it what it ought to be. They thought most of the talk about spiritual laws was mere rhapsody, that the Address inculcated virtual atheism, and that it minimized the Christian revelation.

It must be said that Emerson laid himself open to these serious charges. He spoke as though morality consisted in a perception of moral laws, whereas it is common sense to point out that it resides rather in obedience to those laws. Furthermore, if moral laws are nothing more than laws of our own being it is difficult to see why the sensualist is to be condemned or the brave man praised. It may truly be said that Emerson

failed to deal squarely with the facts of moral failure, remaining always on the lofty and unrealistic plane.

In his peroration the speaker mentioned his expectation that the time might come when men would see "the identity of the law of gravitation with purity of heart." It is hard now, as it was hard then, for careful thinkers to make sense out of this. The law of gravitation belongs to the order of the measurable where there is no element of purposive choice; it cannot be broken. Moral laws, if they exist, can be broken. The right can be resisted when known. It would seem clear that the dignity of moral experience is maintained, not by a foggy oneness with every aspect of nature, but by a recognition of the sharp uniqueness of the sense of obligation.

The statement that "the soul knows no persons" was equally offensive. This was taken, with much justice, as a refusal to attribute personality to God as well as a failure to recognize what was most valuable in Jesus, the incarnation rather than the mere promulgation of principles. When Emerson said, "It is the office of a true teacher to show us that God is, not was; that He speaketh, not spake," he was producing a memorable sentence, but his expression was not precisely accurate. The doctrine of continuous revelation entails that of ancient as well as of modern revelation, and, in our effort to stress the reality of communion with God here and now, there is no need to minimize that which came in Palestine long ago.

IV

The criticism of Emerson's Address was both prompt and vigorous. On the same evening on which Emerson spoke, his friend Henry Ware, Jr. expressed his misgivings, but added that he would probably assent to the unqualified statements if he could take Emerson's qualifications with them. Writing the next day, however, Ware added that this judgment applied only to a portion of the discourse and not to all. Ware's first letter on the subject is wholly admirable.

With regard to some, I must confess that they appear to me more than doubtful, and that their prevalence would tend to overthrow the authority

and influence of Christianity. On this account, I look with anxiety and no little sorrow to the course which your mind has been taking. . . . That I appreciate and rejoice in the lofty ideas and beautiful images of spiritual life, which you throw out, and which stir so many souls, is what gives me a great deal more pleasure to say. I do not believe that anyone has more enjoyment from them.

Emerson replied to this letter in fine spirit, saying in part, "I thought I would not pay the nobleness of my friends so mean a compliment, as to suppress my opposition to their supposed views out of fear of offense."

When the new term opened in the autumn, Ware preached in the Harvard College Chapel a sermon on "The Personality of God" which was clearly intended to counteract pantheistic nonsense. This sermon makes excellent reading today, being written in a clear and convincing style. When we see the careful manner in which Ware wrote, we can understand better why he felt so critical of the Divinity School Address. Though he did not mention Emerson by name, the reference must have been obvious a hundred years ago. "The discussion," he said, "relates not merely to the laws of the universe, and the principles by which its affairs are directed, but to the character and dispositions of the Being who presides over those laws, and by whose will those affairs are determined." It was Emerson and his group who waxed eloquent over *laws*. Ware showed the importance of the concept of personality in moral experience, and its centrality in worship as well as in the sense of obligation. The alternative to a personal God is one who is like a machine, and men do not feel obligations to machines. Furthermore, the Emersonian doctrine is a substitution of an inanimate abstraction in place of God as a concrete reality. "We thus throw out of view the agency and love of the living God, whose children we are, and claim relationship to inanimate abstractions." Ware's crowning argument, still a convincing one, was that the denial of personality to God, amounts to a denial of God. "Indeed," he said, "this is the only sense in which it seems possible to make that denial." No one denies that there are laws of nature, no one denies that there is power in the world. "The only denial possible is by this exclusion of a personal existence. There can be no atheism but this; and this

is atheism." As we compare now Ware's sermon with Emerson's more famous Address the advantage all lies with the former if we are judging by clarity of statement and consistency of reasoning, but these are not the only standards.

Ware, as soon as the Sermon was printed, sent a copy to Concord, accompanied by a letter indicative of a fine and sensitive nature.

By the present mail, you will probably receive a copy of a Sermon, which I have just printed, and which I am unwilling should fall into your hands without a word from myself accompanying it. It has been regarded as controverting some positions taken by you at various times, and was indeed, written partly with a view to them. But I am anxious to have it understood, that, as I am not perfectly aware of the precise nature of the opinions on the subject of the discourse, nor upon exactly what speculations they are grounded, I do not, therefore, pretend especially to enter the lists with them, but rather to give my own views of an important subject, and of the evils which seem to be attendant on a rejection of the established opinions.

Emerson's reply to this letter of Ware's gives one of the best clues we have to the sage's mind and to the real character of the Address. Emerson wrote:

I believe I must tell you what I think of my new position. It strikes me very oddly, that good and wise men at Cambridge and Boston should think of raising me into an object of criticism. I have always been, — from my very incapacity of methodical writing, — "a chartered libertine," free to worship and free to rail, — lucky when I could make myself understood, but never esteemed near enough to the institutions and mind of society to deserve the notice of the masters of literature and religion. . . . I could not give account of myself if challenged. I could not possibly give you one of the "arguments" you cruelly hint at, on which any doctrine of mine stands. For I don't know what arguments mean in reference to any expression of a thought.

Here was the real contrast. Ware, like the other critics, was a thinker in the ordinary sense of the term. The young man from Concord, on the other hand, was always the poet, striking out from bold intuitions, without filling in the separate steps. Today we can have great sympathy for both sides of the controversy at the same time that we note the weakness of both. There was no real meeting of minds, since the poet was as unable to understand the scholar, as the scholar the poet. But though there was no real meeting of minds as

between Ware and Emerson, so that neither understood the other, there was a profound similarity in character, and there had been common ties of great strength. Ware's letter to Emerson, written on board ship in 1829, when he had left his beloved parish to the care of the younger man gives evidence of real friendship. Both were tender men and both were courageous men. It hurt Emerson, if we may trust his own words, to speak as he did in Divinity Hall, he "could not but feel pain in saying some things in that place and presence," and, likewise, it hurt Ware to criticize. "If I could have helped it," wrote the latter, "I would not have let you know how much I feel."

V

Though the controversy between Ware and Emerson was carried on in a spirit which makes us admire both of them, other aspects of the controversy were of a very different character. Too many of the accounts of the "storm" have been written on the assumption that it was all of a piece. The Boston Quarterly Review was similar to Ware in its approach, combining a gracious admiration for the freshness and beauty of the discourse with a frank criticism of its "mistiness," its "vagueness," and its "undigested philosophy," but when we read the other reviews we find, for the most part, nothing but bitter denunciation.

The attack of Andrews Norton was conducted in a spirit very different from Ware's and on grounds that are less defensible. This able scholar, father of a son destined to be more famous than himself, was only fifty-two years of age when the Address was given, but he had resigned his professional chair eight years before, and was living in watchful retirement at Shady Hill. Norton first struck out with an article signed A. N. which appeared in the Boston Daily Advertiser. The article angered Emerson sufficiently to cause him to write in his Journal of "the feminine vehemence" of its author.

Norton's vehemence, feminine or otherwise, found its great opportunity when the retired professor was asked to address the recently formed Alumni Association of the School. For a

title to his address Norton coined the vigorous phrase, "The Latest Form of Infidelity," and his hearers understood perfectly the form of thought to which he referred. It was clear that he had in mind the cluster of ideas which he traced to an European origin and of which Emerson's Address of 1838 was coming to be the accepted formulation.

The latest form of infidelity is distinguished by assuming the Christian name, while it strikes directly at the root of faith in Christianity, and indirectly of all religion, by denying the miracles attesting the divine mission of Christ.

Andrews Norton was most convincing when he spoke of the basis of evidence. The Transcendentalists talked easily of certainty, by which they meant their own inner conviction, and they seemed peculiarly unmindful of the need of external tests to help in determining whether the individual were a fool or a prophet. The new school rejected *historical* Christianity since it gave only second hand evidence and probability rather than certainty. "The dwellers in the region of shadows complain," Norton said, "that the solid earth is not stable enough for them to rest on. They have firm footing on the clouds."

As the months wore on it must have become clear, even to Emerson, that the "storm in our washbowl" was really a storm of some proportions. The Christian Examiner not only denounced Emerson's Address as "neither good divinity nor good sense," but also attempted to remove the stain from Harvard's reputation. "It will not be necessary," the editors wrote, "for us to point out to persons of the least discernment, that the character of the theology of the Cambridge School is more likely to be learned from the discourses and other publications of its professors, than from the Address which we have just noticed."

When the Princeton Review noticed Emerson's Address, in the issue of January, 1839, no tender words were reserved for "Mr. Emerson's rhapsody," and the editors expressed their pleasure in learning that it has proved offensive to the authorities of the university. "This Address is before us," they wrote. "We have read it, and we want words with which to express our sense of the nonsense and impiety which pervade it." A year

later the same journal referred to the Address as "a rhapsodical oration in favour of pantheism." Thus the storm went on, the fury decreasing as the years advanced.

VI

The situation as it developed was tragic and wasteful. Emerson, in his desire to infuse new life and fresh conviction, expressed his thought so poetically and so loosely that he seemed to deny what he did not really deny. In the same manner his chief opponents, in their antagonism to what they considered the arrogance, the censoriousness, and the mistiness of the Address, came to be classified as deniers of what they also had no intention of denying. That Henry Ware, Jr. did not reject the idea of first hand experience may be known by a consideration of his other writings. Four years after Emerson spoke, Ware addressed the students in the same place as follows:

Preach *experimentally*, not as a discourseser, but as a partaker. Have religious experience. Speak from personal knowledge.

It may be doubted if Emerson ever understood what Ware and Norton meant or even saw the difference between a nature mysticism and the worship of the Heavenly Father to which Christian experience bears witness. Part of Emerson's failure to comprehend the objections of his critics must be attributed to the meagerness of his theological education. We are surprised when we note how brief the period of his actual study in the Divinity School was. When we realize that he began his studies at Divinity Hall in February, 1825, and received his authorization as a preacher in October, 1826, and when we realize, furthermore, that this brief period was severely interrupted by hindrances of many kinds, we are not surprised that his theological training was poor. What evidence do we have that he ever seriously studied Christianity or wrestled, in a thorough manner, with the great attempts to build a consistent world view in the light of the Christian revelation? Like Carlyle, he often uttered, with an appearance of originality, what was a well known Christian conviction.

In the absence of rigid theological training, Emerson stocked

his mind with a multitude of scattered impressions. It is well known that he was influenced by German thinkers through whom he became acquainted with Kantian philosophy in a strangely altered form. Many of the contemporary criticisms made the assumption that this was *the* source of Emerson's ideas, but the study of his Journal shows that this is not the whole story. He was drawn to various men of prophetic temper, one of the chief of these being George Fox, whose Journal Emerson knew well and who was the subject of an unpublished lecture. From Emerson's own Journal we can learn that the memory of Fox was with him during the weeks just preceding the delivery of the Divinity School Address, when the discourse was taking shape. Thus on June 21, three weeks before delivery, he wrote in his Journal:

Have you had doubts? Have you struggled with coldness; with apathy; with self-contempt that made you pale and thin? George Fox perambulated England in his perplexity.

Here, more than in any other place, is the key to the Address. It was conventional apathy that Emerson was constrained to strike, and his weapon was the central conviction of George Fox, the conviction that revelation can be continuous and immediate, that a first hand religion is possible. All that is best in Emerson's Address is a restatement of this conviction in eloquent words, whereas the remainder, the part most severely criticized, has already been forgotten.

If Emerson had been content to assert his major theme, it is highly likely that there would have been no strong criticism of his words, but he was not content to stop there. Perhaps, however, his words might not even be remembered now if he had been so judicious. Emerson did not need to be judicious for the experience of a century has done the sifting for him, making the central idea stand out from its verbal setting.

The Divinity School Address is the seed bed of much that is finest in Emerson's later work. Having stated the theme with boldness, he went on to ring the changes on the conviction that the contact with Reality was so close as to admit no intermediaries. In "Self-Reliance," this became: "The relations of the soul to the divine spirit are so pure that it is profane to seek

to interpose helps." In "The Poet" we learn that poetry is the first hand acquaintance which pulls aside the intermediate veil. "The sign and credentials of the poet are, that he announces that which no man foretold. He is the true and only doctor; he knows and tells; he is the only teller of news, for he was present and privy to the appearance which he described." In "The Over-Soul" we find that the grand distinction between literary teachers is that some write out of a background of direct knowledge, whereas others write of knowledge *about*. Emerson is on familiar ground when he tells us that "one class speak *from within*, or from experience, as parties and possessors of the fact; and the other class, *from without*, as spectators merely, or perhaps as acquainted with the fact on the evidence of third persons."

The Address constitutes a wild promise of the entire Emersonian universe of thought and expression. It occupies the place in Emerson's career which Chesterton has so acutely assigned to Pickwick in the career of Dickens, it is "the mere mass of light before the creation of sun or moon." The primeval Emersonian light seemed to shine for the sake of seven young men, but it actually went far beyond them. Though the graduates did not constitute especially fertile soil, and, indeed, did not have particularly brilliant careers, the message addressed to them was received by others in such a manner that it has been preached from a thousand pulpits, the occupants of which have been unconscious of their debt to Emerson.

In 1879, three years before he died, Ralph Waldo Emerson again addressed the Divinity School, speaking again in the tiny chapel of Divinity Hall. On this occasion he was introduced with lavish praise, on this occasion there were no anxious critics fearful of what he might say. But, though conditions were thus pleasant, something was lacking. There was no longer the electric expectancy of that July evening in 1838. Men heard Emerson gladly in Divinity Hall in 1879, but what he said made no real difference, whereas forty-one years before it had made a tremendous difference. Emerson had made his speech in 1838, and there was really nothing more for him to say.

SOME PERSONAL AND SOCIAL ASPECTS OF NAVAHO CEREMONIAL PRACTICE ¹

CLYDE KLUCKHOHN ²

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

HERE and there in the published literature on Navaho ceremonials one finds a suggestive detail or an illuminating general statement bearing on the relationship of ceremonial organization to social organization,³ but we have not yet had a systematic analysis of any body of data from this point of view. This paper will supplement my "Participation in Ceremonials in a Navaho Community"⁴ in the direction of providing an account of the "religious" behaviors of the Ramah-Atarque Navahos. The treatment will center around the family and clan affiliation of practitioners, their teachers, patients, and those attending ceremonials, but it will be convenient to incorporate also a few details bearing on individual status.

No circumstance reflects more dramatically the interdependence of the ceremonial and social organization of this Navaho society than the fact that, if a singer or curer sings over his own wife, their future relationship is perforce governed by the rules regulating the behavior between men and women of the same clan. Nor is this simply theory. In the two cases (out of nearly a thousand for which I have the relevant facts) where a singer did sing over his own wife, the marriage was immediately and permanently dissolved.⁵ Medical ethics in our society dictate,

¹ This paper was read to the Yale Anthropology Club on January 31st, 1938.

² The writer gratefully acknowledges financial assistance from the Division of Anthropology in Harvard University for the field work upon which this paper is based. The paper has had the benefit of helpful criticism from Dr. Leland C. Wyman, Professor Arthur Nock, Mr. Harry Tschopik, Jr., and Miss Malcom Carr.

³ It is recognized of course that these headings are abstractions which, if pressed very far, do violence to the intricate interdependence of essentially all bits of behavior. This whole paper indeed constitutes a demonstration from the data on one society that these categories overlap. But the abstractions are commonly used, are convenient, and are hardly misleading if treated purely heuristically.

⁴ American Anthropologist, vol. 40, 1938, pp. 359-370.

⁵ Just because it is so unusual, so "dangerous" for a man to sing over his own wife, such a ceremonial is thought of as unusually potent. When, therefore, a singer's wife is seriously or chronically ill and other singers have treated her without success,

of course, that a physician does not treat the members of his own immediate family. But that it is not merely an analogous practice which operates here is shown by the fact that a man frequently sings over his own children and over his maternal nieces and nephews. Moreover, there is the further bit of theory that a singer may not later marry a woman who has at any time been his patient, and I have no record of any case where this occurred. Indeed the Navahos recognize the general principle involved. One informant (12) stated, "After a man has sung over someone, those two must act afterward just like two people in the same clan."⁶ Highly similar remarks were volunteered by five other informants. Several informants affirmed that this held for diagnosis also, but I have three cases where husband or wife diagnosed for the other partner without separation ensuing. My inference, on the basis of general knowledge of the culture, is that the theory is applicable, but that, since diagnosis is regarded as somewhat less serious business, the principle is violated more lightly.

THE LEARNING OF CEREMONIALS

Let us now take up a detailed case history of the learning of ceremonials by members of this group. I present these data rather fully because no comparable set has been published⁷ and because they not only constitute a basis for induction as to our central interest, but are also pertinent to other ethnological questions.

her own husband may, as a last desperate attempt, agree to conduct a ceremonial himself.

⁶ One is reminded of the fact that curing societies in many pueblos add to their membership the individuals whom they treat. Dr. Elsie Clews Parsons has called my attention to the fact that at Zuñi marriage with ceremonial fathers and their families is forbidden.

⁷ At the time of writing this paper I had not seen Hill's data (Willard W. Hill, *The Agricultural and Hunting Methods of the Navaho Indians*, Yale University Publications in Anthropology: 18, 1938, pp. 100-101) on the teacher-learner relationship in hunting ceremonials. In general, these data seem to accord very well with the conclusions reached here. See also Franc Newcomb and Gladys Reichard, *Sandpaintings of the Navajo Shooting Chant* (New York, 1937), pp. 8-9.

Dick Pino (1)⁸ is about sixty years old and is a member of Clan 37.⁹ About thirty-five years ago he began to learn the Chiricahua Apache Wind Way from his father's maternal nephew (Clan 22 — same as informant's father, of course) who lived north of Gallup but practised frequently in this area. It was about five years before he was considered competent to conduct the ceremonial himself. The learning was carried out mainly through attendance upon the teacher when he was singing in the Ramah region (and twice he assisted the singer near his own home), but there were also a number of occasions when the teacher gave him private and individual instruction. Gradually he was given more important responsibilities as an assistant. Parts of the ceremonial which he had learned completely he conducted independently as a "curer." The singer conducted the ceremonial over the learner four times,¹⁰ twice in winter and twice in summer.¹¹ Finally on one occasion, when the old man was approached by one of those present at the last night of a Chiricahua Apache Wind Way to sing for a member of his family, he said, "Why don't you get this man here who has been helping me? He can do it all right now."

Excerpts from two discussions of learning by singers will supplement the above case history. Jake (2) observed:

"The singer knows which of those who are following him around know things. Sometimes he will ask them questions and take what they say. The people who come to the sing hear this. Sometimes the singer tells the people that a man who is helping him knows it all. So the people decide to ask him to sing for that. . . .

⁸ Numbers referring to informants are the same as those used in Leland C. Wyman and Clyde Kluckhohn (Navaho Classification of Their Song Ceremonials, *Memoirs, American Anthropological Association*, No. 50, 1938), and as will be used in subsequent publications.

⁹ The numerals refer to the list in Gladys Reichard (*Social Life of the Navajo Indians*, New York, 1928) and are used to avoid expensive type-setting of phonetic characters. The differentiation of clans rather than their names would seem to be in point here, and the interested specialist can check very readily. This work of Reichard's also contains (p. 146) some useful data on the learning of ceremonials.

¹⁰ This is called *be·zdi·yin do·leḡ bini·yé* "for the purpose of making him holy."

¹¹ One informant (2) stated that, where there were male and female versions of a

"When you learn a chant from a man you must always keep it exactly like you were taught. Each man must follow his own teacher exactly all his life. That's why you see different singers doing things a little bit different. Every man is sticking to what his teacher taught him.

"You get lots of practice. Even when your teacher sings over you, you sing along with it yourself. Every other time [in chants, not in Blessing Way rites] the patient just keeps still and lets the singer and the others sing for him. But when a man is learning he sings even when he is a patient. That way, pretty soon he gets so that when he sings one song, another comes right up in front of him. It's just like when you are riding along, looking a long ways. First one thing comes up, then another. That's the way they learn it."

The following remarks are from comments of Solao (3):

"You can learn a sing by parts. You can learn just a few songs and part of the story. You can just get the medicine without the songs. Lots of people do it that way. Some singers will give the songs without the story. It isn't really right, though. The story always goes with the songs and the medicines. That's the only way you can remember it all just like it's supposed to be."

There is actually a good deal of informal learning of songs, medicines, and parts of ceremonial behaviors. Indeed most of the adult men of this group, whether singers or curers or not, have varying amounts of such knowledge and are in demand as "helpers." In general, however, anyone who attempts to conduct ceremonials without having entered into a somewhat formalized teacher-learner relationship meets with disapproval on the part of recognized practitioners and distrust on the part of people generally.¹²

ceremonial, the prospective singer ought to have both sung over him, even though he planned to sing but the one himself.

¹² The material presented thus far is so representative of the practice and theory of learning and acceptance that hereafter I shall mention only important divergences from these patterns. The only general qualification to be made is that in the case of learning "blackenings" (portions of Evil Way ceremonials in which the patient's body is blackened) or other excerpts from ceremonials the practice is that the teacher con-

Dick Pino does not remember precisely what he paid for his instruction and training but said it included "one horse, some money, things at different times. Then I paid him what I got the first time I sung by myself — you always have to do that, and I gave him part of what I got every time after that for quite a while." About thirty years ago (in other words, at about the time he began to sing the Chiricahua Apache Wind Way) Dick Pino started to learn the Life Way, Female Shooting Branch; Evil Way, Female Shooting Branch; Shooting Way, Female Branch (including the Upper Regions Side and Dark Circle of Branches Phase) together with various supplementary ceremonies from an unrelated singer of Clan 35 who lived in the Two Wells region but also practised frequently near Ramah. After about three years Dick Pino was called upon to conduct Life Way, but it was "about seven years before I started to do the other two by myself." Once again Dick made no pretence at remembering exactly the fees and royalties he had paid, saying: "That old man taught me for little because he was a very good friend. I gave him a horse and a bridle and a few other little things, I don't remember what. After I started to sing by myself I gave him some blankets." At various times (thirty to fifteen years ago) Dick learned many of the songs of Blessing Way from his father. Apparently he made no attempt to learn the whole ceremonial systematically, but he knows enough to conduct the girl's adolescence rite. Twelve years ago Dick Pino learned the blackening forms of Moving Up Way and of Evil Way, Male Shooting Branch from his maternal uncle. Learning these required only attendance at "eight or ten" performances of the ceremonials and "a few hours extra with my maternal uncle alone." No fee was paid except for conducting the ceremonials over the learner once.¹³

ducts the ceremonial over the learner but once. (Statements as to the theory here involved were conflicting, being mainly apparent rationalizations after the fact.)

Father Berard Haile (*Origin Legend of the Navaho Enemy Way*, Yale University Publications in Anthropology: 17, 1938) makes some interesting general remarks on the learning of ceremonials (pp. 12-14).

¹³ Future statements that no fee was paid are to be understood as "no fee other than that for the ceremonial or ceremonials conducted by teacher over learner."

Jake (2) is about eighty-five years old and is a member of Clan 22. When he was in his early twenties he learned Flint Way, Female Branch and two blackenings from his maternal uncle (the same who taught Dick Pino Chiricahua Apache Wind Way). He began to practise the blackenings within about two years, but it was about ten years before he knew the legend and all the songs of Flint Way properly.¹⁴ He paid no fee. When he was "nearly forty" he acquired Evil Way, Female Shooting Branch; Life Way, Female Shooting Branch from the same singer of Clan 35 who also taught Dick Pino these ceremonials. Jake learned them in "just two or three years" but only learned part of the legends. He paid "a lot" but was unable to be specific.

Solao (3) is a member of Clan 18 and must be very close to ninety years old. When he was about thirty-five he learned Flint Way, Male Branch from an unrelated man of Clan 17 who lived in the Two Wells Area. He paid "a horse, ten sheep, and some cash." At roughly the same period he learned Blessing Way from an unrelated man (Clan 35) who lived near Tohaci, paying two deerskins, a pair of moccasins, and some silver. Some five years later he learned a blackening from an unrelated man (clan uncertain), paying a pair of pants, a deer-skin, some money.

Coming now to the curers ¹⁵ (with whom we shall deal more summarily), it may be noted that of the three who know Blessing Way two learned from their fathers and paid no fee. The third (Rafael: 16) learned from his father's younger brother who lived near Mariana Lake, but stayed with Rafael for nearly a year while he was teaching him. Besides food and clothing during this period, Rafael gave his uncle five unbroken

¹⁴ "Some people can learn the songs, some can't. Finally my maternal uncle took a dry ear of corn, and every time he sings one song he takes off a kernel and puts it in a cup. Then he got an unmarried girl who was related to me to grind these kernels up into mush. He put this in a medicine basket and let it cool. Then he sung and while he was singing he put some of that mush in my mouth. He did this four times while he sang a special song. Then he made me eat the rest of the mush as fast as I could with all five fingers. After that I didn't have much more trouble."

¹⁵ A "singer" is a practitioner who knows at least one five-night chant. A "curer" knows only portions of one or more chants.

horses and a Navaho rug. Sam Pino (4) learned the Chiricahua Apache Wind Way from the same man who taught his older brother, Dick Pino, and paid comparable fees. He is at present studying the Shooting Way, Female Branch with Dick Pino and very frequently assists him. He gives his older brother a basket or some other gift from time to time. Jaciano (6),¹⁶ Margadito (5), and Julio (17) are all sons of Jake and members of Clan 51a, but no one of them has learned all the "medicine" of their father. Jaciano acquired Evil Way, Female Shooting Branch; Life Way, Female Shooting Branch; and one blackening from Jake, paying no fees. In addition, he has learned the nine day form of the Shooting Way, Female Branch from an unrelated member of Clan 32 who lives near Crownpoint. He has also just finished learning the Chiricahua Apache Wind Way. He began his studies with a deceased member of the Ramah group (Clan 35), and finished with a teacher (a fellow clansman and distant relative) who lives near Thoreau. Margadito has learned portions only (and no legends) of the Shooting Way, Female Branch; Life Way, Female Shooting Branch; and one blackening. Julio has learned only a part of the Shooting Way, Female Branch.¹⁷ Neither Julio nor Margadito made any payment to their father who was their only teacher. Richard Pino (34) has learned most of the Chiricahua Apache Wind Way; part of the Shooting Way, Female Branch; and one blackening from his maternal uncle (Dick Pino) and has paid no fees. José Martin (13), a member of Clan 35, has learned part of the Life Way, Female Shooting Branch from Jake who is unrelated. He has also learned two sandpaintings (and attendant songs and ceremonies) of the Shooting Way, Female Branch from an unrelated member of Clan 22 who lives in the Two Wells Country. Oyez (22), Clan 22, and Frank Navaho (23), Clan 22, have learned portions of Hand Trembling Way and Hand Trembling Evil Way from the latter's father, Clan 17, who lives in the Danoff region. Frank Navaho made

¹⁶ Jaciano is, strictly speaking, a singer rather than a curer, but, since he moved to the Alamo-Puertecito area ten years ago (returning to the Ramah Region only occasionally to conduct ceremonials), it is convenient to consider him here.

¹⁷ Julio is the youngest of the three brothers mentioned but is past fifty.

no payment. Sellio (18), Clan 51a, learned portions of the Life Way, Female Shooting Branch from a deceased, unrelated member of this group (Clan 35). Sellio paid him the horse which he received for conducting his first ceremonial. Felipe (8), Clan 51a, learned part of the Chiricahua Apache Wind Way from a brother living near Thoreau (the same who taught Jaciano). Felipe paid his brother the fees for his first ceremonials. For the same consideration he learned a blackening from a brother of Jake who lived near Crownpoint. Patricio Garcia (19), Clan 18, learned the same blackening from Felipe (his sister's husband) and paid him his first fees. Frank Martin (20), Clan 37, learned a blackening from a deceased maternal uncle of his mother and taught this blackening to George Bieber (21), Clan 1, who turned over his first fees. Acho (24) has learned part of the Shooting Way, Female Branch without any formalized relation to any teacher but simply by "picking it up."¹⁸

These are the facts from this area. There are two questions of theory which, while having little or no bearing on the interpretation of this particular set of data, are relevant to our general understanding of the question. A number of practitioners remarked that in the past some ceremonials *were* connected with particular clans. For example, seven informants independently mentioned (and four independently disagreed) that only men from clans whose names include "water" were supposed to do Blessing Way. Three others referred to the predilection of members of clans whose names include "red" (most especially members of Clan 20) for chants of the God-Impersonators Sub-Group. One singer (cc — from near Tohaci) commented on the virtual disappearance of correlation be-

¹⁸ Dick Pino (1) commented upon this: "A year ago I was singing Shooting Way, Female Branch over at Sam's place. That boy, he was there but he got scared and started to shake. He went out and went away. He got worse during the night — got stiff, his arms bent in, his hands shut tight, his legs twisted. Two men went over and brought him back inside where I was singing. They put him beside Gayadito's son whom I was singing over. Then he got better. . . . People who start singing that way without studying with a singer and paying him, they always get sick. If they don't get sick right away, they get sick when they get older and have to straighten that up themselves. The best way is to learn from a singer the right way." (Acho has sung but once in his life and is not even called a curer.)

tween clan and ceremonial: "The trouble is that singers teach their songs to their sons no matter what clan they belong to. So things got all mixed up and aren't the way they were meant to be."

To some very slight extent other factors of selection are operative. A person who has narrowly escaped being struck by lightning is held to be peculiarly qualified to learn the chants (and especially the Shooting chants) for which the lightnings are considered etiological factors.

Summary. The data on the teacher's relationship to the learner may be tabulated as follows:¹⁹

<u>Father</u>	<u>Mother's Brother</u>	<u>Own Brother</u>	<u>Blood Relative ²⁰ in Own Clan</u>
<u>7</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Blood Relative ¹⁹ in Father's Clan</u>		<u>Unrelated Clansman</u>	
<u>3</u>		<u>0</u>	
<u>Unrelated Member of Father's Clan</u>		<u>Unrelated</u>	
<u>0</u>		<u>10</u>	

On the basis of these figures ²¹ it would seem possible to make the following general statements (only necessarily applicable to this particular group of Navaho, of course):

1. Close biological-sociological relationship appears to be a determinant of the transmission of ceremonial knowledge in about two cases out of three. At the same time ceremonials can be and frequently are learned from persons to whom there is no formalized sociological relationship. There is little evidence that clan, as such, is a factor of importance in the initiation of the teacher-learner relationship.²²

¹⁹ In the tabulation I have included two cases (based on a member of this group who died five years ago) not discussed in the text.

²⁰ Defined as any putatively biological relationship to which the informant called attention.

²¹ The statistical inadequacy of the numbers is largely compensated for by the clearness of the trend. And the conclusions are, in a general way, confirmed by statements reflecting the native ideology. To questions of this sort, "From whom should a Navaho learn a ceremonial?" replies followed this general pattern, "From anyone. Usually from a relative or a friend." Data are inadequate to judge whether the learner most often bases his choice upon relationship to a possible teacher or upon interest in a particular ceremonial, but my impression is that the former prevails more frequently.

²² After the ceremonial has been learned, the new singer does stand, of course, to

2. The particular persons from whom ceremonials are most often learned are the father and the maternal uncle. To these two only are no fees paid. These facts confirm the evidence from other sources of the rough equivalence of father and maternal uncle (in some contexts at least) in Navaho social structure.

3. Payment for instruction, like payment for ceremonials, is not rigidly standardized but varies with kinship, friendship, and other factors. The nearest approach to a standard fee is in the case of learning a blackening or some other shortened form of a ceremonial where (unless the teacher was a father or maternal uncle) the payment was uniformly ²³ the first fee received by the learner. It is interesting to note that, although some payment is regarded as prerequisite to the efficacy of a ceremonial, no payment is required (when the teacher is a father or maternal uncle) for ceremonial instruction itself.

4. It is apparent that a very large proportion of the ceremonial knowledge of this community derives ultimately from two individuals — the two principal teachers of Dick Pino and Jake.

DIVINATION

A rather striking feature of Navaho culture to which attention has never been explicitly drawn is the contrast between the manner in which ceremonials are learned and the manner in which the practice of hand-trembling divination is begun.²⁴ The former falls into the "priestly" tradition — there is formal

his teacher in a relationship which is highly special but does seem to be roughly comparable to that obtaining between clansmen.

²³ In all cases which my data cover — and this uniformity is not contradicted by any other facts in my possession.

²⁴ On this general question cf. Grenville Goodwin, *The White Mountain Apache Religion* (*American Anthropologist*, Vol. 40, 1938), p. 37 and *passim*. In the lore of Navaho chants there are but a few hints of direct contact with the supernatural of the shamanistic type. Hill (*op. cit.*, p. 74) in discussing the Rain Chant gives one of the most striking of these: "During a ceremony, the individuals in a hogan were supposed to sit and think hard, stare straight ahead, and be very quiet. If the chanter were performing the ceremony in the right manner some one of the audience would get a vision pertaining to the chanter and his objective. This would be a sign that the ceremony was being properly conducted and that it would be successful."

instruction in a system of abundant lore. The latter falls into the "shamanistic" tradition — there is no formal instruction and a minimum of lore; it is a question of a direct "gift."²⁵ It is also interesting that while only nine of the sixteen who sometimes do hand-trembling are women, actually they carried out nearly eighty per cent of the diagnoses of which I have record.

Since persons doing divination by hand-trembling have no teacher, we cannot attempt to discover relationships to social organization in the manner which we utilized in the case of the singers and curers. But study of the data nevertheless reveals a very pertinent tendency. Eleven of the sixteen fall into four fraternities: two brothers; two brothers; three sisters; three sisters and a brother. Two other diagnosticians are married to two of the sisters of the last-named fraternity. Moreover, the first-named pair are the sons of a dead sister in this fraternity who also did hand-trembling. In other words, half of the diagnosticians are closely associated with a single family group (which incidentally is that of the singer, Jake). Two of the remaining women diagnosticians are daughter and maternal aunt-foster mother. In sum, out of the sixteen there is but a single one who is not closely related to at least one other diagnostician. That the culture seems to recognize a tendency for the capacity to be associated with family lines seems indicated by the following:

(Richard Pino's wife: 30): "About eight years ago a singer from over near Thoreau came to sing Life Way, Female Shooting Branch for the son of Antonio's sister. My older sister had done hand-trembling and figured out that he should come and that he should sing this, but the boy was very sick and didn't get better. So my younger sister did motion-in-the-hand and said the same singer should do Flint Way, Male Branch which he also knew. But the boy still didn't get better. So one day while he was doing medicine the singer stopped singing and

²⁵ None of the singers in this society practise divination also. Of the seventeen curers only two do motion-in-the-hand, and of these one has diagnosed but once in two years and the other has carried on but a single ceremonial during this time and is but barely recognized as a curer. It seems fairly clear that a different temperamental selection operates for the two occupations. I have also a decided impression that the community feels that both professions ought not to be practised by the same person.

said to me: 'This isn't doing any good. I don't think we've got the right way yet. Your sisters can do hand-trembling. I think you can do it too. Sometimes people who just start to do hand-trembling find things out easier than people who have been doing it a long time.' So he put medicine on my hand and sang several Hand-Trembling Way songs and put corn meal on my hand. While he was singing my hand started to shake."²⁶

It will perhaps be enlightening from the general ethnological point of view to follow out case histories of the circumstances under which these sixteen individuals first began to "shake."²⁷ Five diagnosticians became conscious of their powers under conditions of solitude — either out herding sheep or in the hogan alone at night. Some actual statements are psychologically interesting:

Crazy Woman (25): "A long time ago I was out herding sheep by myself. I lay down and went to sleep a little while. I got up and felt bad. I didn't think like I used to — I felt like I was drunk or something. It seemed like somebody was talking to me, but I didn't see anyone. The voices told me to go some place and I started to go and then my hand and arm started to shake. I couldn't stop it. Then I thought of something my father had lost and it quit. I went and told my father and I was right. After that people started coming to me to find things they'd lost or for me to tell them what singer to get and what sing to have."

26 (younger sister of 25): "I had just had a baby about twenty days before. I was pretty sick and sometimes my mind was about gone. One night I was all alone with my little baby. Pretty soon I felt like someone was with us — grown people and babies. I ran out of the hogan and hollered to these people. I started to do hand-trembling. My mind was all gone. My relatives got the fat singer of Hand Trembling Way from Danoff and he straightened me up so I could do hand-trembling

²⁶ This and all other translations are exactly as rendered by my interpreters, Dave Skeet (12) and Frank Pino (31), except that I have translated certain technical words (names of ceremonials and the like) which they left in Navaho.

²⁷ For descriptions of hand-trembling divination see Leland C. Wyman, *Navaho Diagnosticians* (American Anthropologist, Vol. 38, 1936, pp. 236-247).

all right. He put pollen on my arm and sung for me and said I could do it for the people from then on."

Golastico (9): "When I was about fifteen I lay down in the shade at noon one day and took a nap. I was alone. I had been out all morning with the sheep. All of a sudden I woke up and my arm was shaking hard and I couldn't stop it for about fifteen minutes. I told people about that but it was three years before anybody asked me to find out what was making them sick."

27 (younger brother of 9): "I was out looking for horses alone. When the sun got hot I went to sleep under a tree. I woke up faint and in a daze. Right away my hand started to shake."

All of these accounts (except possibly the third) fit very nicely into the picture of shamanism (in the narrow sense). Julio (17) was seized with a violent attack of hand-trembling while watching his sister (28) perform diagnosis. In the remaining ten cases the onset of hand-trembling occurred while the individual was either attending a ceremonial (six instances) or the patient in a ceremonial (four instances). The attack occurred in four cases while the patient was sitting on the sand-painting and singing was going on, in six cases simply during singing. In four cases the ceremonial in question was one or the other of two forms of Hand Trembling Way (no other ceremonial occurs more than once in the list).²⁸ If I may be permitted to speculate, I should like to suggest the possibility that this second pattern of acquiring hand-trembling is a secondary development and represents a kind of linking up of the shamanistic form of "religious" behavior with the ceremonial form. That the connection is strongly felt is shown (among other ways) by the fact that one diagnostician (Juanita: 15) scarcely dares enter a hogan where a ceremonial is being carried on lest uncontrollable arm-quivering ensue. Another evidence is that diagnosticians feel that they must have ceremonials at intervals, regardless of any organic difficulty. Jake (2) said of his son-in-law Salamon (35): "He doesn't like to do hand-trembling any more. He's afraid he is getting

²⁸ Cf. Wyman, 1936 (op. cit.), pp. 239, 243.

sick from doing it too much without being sung over.”²⁹ Most of the case histories of the second pattern reveal also a kind of ceremonial sanction for the inborn gift. A few examples will serve:

Juanita (15): “I was very sick. Dick Pino was singing Chiricahua Apache Wind Way for me. When the people were all singing the last night I felt a trembling in my chest and it got heavier and heavier. Next I felt my upper arm moving. My breath was tied up. Then I started to do hand-trembling. So the singer put pollen on my hand and arm and sang a few Hand Trembling Way songs.”

Solao’s wife (32): “My stomach and legs were all swollen up. They decided to have Hand Trembling Evil Way for me. The second day when the doctor had me sit on the sandpainting and started to sing my hand shook a little. Each day after that when I got on the painting it shook a little more. The last night they made a painting on buckskin. When I sat on that and the doctor sang my hand shook hard and wouldn’t stop. So he put pollen on it and sang special songs and said after that I could help people when they asked me.”

Mrs. Big (33): “About twenty years ago I was very sick and lay in bed and couldn’t do anything. They put up Mountain Top Way for me. My sister’s husband was the singer. The first time they put me on a sandpainting my hand shook a little bit. But it kept getting worse each time. The people decided about me then and decided to do the right thing for me so I could do hand-trembling for the people. My sister’s husband put corn pollen on my hand and sang a few Hand Trembling

²⁹ A number of informants (13, 2, 1, 6, 15) stated or inferred that Hand Trembling Way ceremonials were the cure par excellence for “hand-trembling sickness.” This theory is, I suspect, of comparatively recent origin. But ideological association between the rite of divination and the ceremonial is also evidenced by the circumstance that (at least in the Ramah and Danoff-Two Wells areas) singers of Hand Trembling Way do not sing other ceremonials, although in far the greater number of cases in these areas a singer who knows a whole ceremonial also conducts parts at least of others. (Systematic enquiry during the summer of 1938 among a large number of informants in various parts of the Navaho country revealed only a single case — near Pine Springs — of a singer of Hand Trembling Way who sung other full ceremonials. Certainly a trend toward a uniformity is indicated here, although no informant seemed aware of it as a matter of theory.)

Way songs for me so I could do hand-trembling all I want. If you are going to do hand-trembling right, people have to sing and pray for you."

Richard Pino (34): "Eighteen years ago one of Antonio's boys went crazy part of the time; they were singing Hand Trembling Way for him. One night I was helping with the sandpainting. While I was moving my arm up and down somebody said it looked broken out. I looked at it and it looked drawn out big. After the boy sat on the sandpainting and they started singing, my arm started shaking. So they sang over me too and gave me the regular medicine of the sing and put pollen on my hand so I could do it right."

Summary. 1. In this Navaho society diagnosticians tend to be, as a matter of observation, concentrated in certain biological lines and family groups. There is some slight evidence that at least the biological aspect of this generalization finds a place in the theory of the culture. There is no evidence whatsoever that clan, as such, influences the distribution of hand-trembling diagnosticians in this population.

2. There are two principal patterned ways of acquiring hand-trembling divination. Both reflect a different underlying concept of relation to the supernatural from that which do, in general, the ceremonials and manner of learning ceremonials. But the second perhaps represents a bridge across a fundamental dichotomy of Navaho religion.

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PATIENTS AND PRACTITIONERS

In how far do clan and family ties influence the choice of a singer, curer, or diagnostician? I have studied the relevant data fairly fully, but since their interpretation seems quite straightforward in all except trifling particulars and since they are not otherwise informing I shall present only the results of analysis. After stating the widest generalizations which the facts seem to permit I shall enlarge somewhat upon various aspects of these generalizations and make certain qualifications.

Aside from personal likes and dislikes and inter-family feuds (and these considerations appear to have played an extremely small rôle during the period of my study), the determining factors in the choice of a practitioner appear to be: close relationship by blood or marriage, geographical propinquity, specialized knowledge on the part of the practitioner. To a considerable extent the economic question of the fees which must be paid is a kind of master factor conditioning the significance of these three: the related practitioner charges less; the fee is to some extent a function of the distance the practitioner must travel; the specialist with a reputation for unusual knowledge commands higher payments in Navaho society as in our own. These implications must constantly be borne in mind, but it will be useful to treat the three factors named as abstracted from the very significant economic context.

The relative importance of these three factors varies with other circumstances. In the case of minor illnesses and somewhat perfunctory brief ceremonials, geographic propinquity would appear to be the dominant determinant. If a curer lives a few miles away his services will be secured even though the patient's own father is a leading singer — if the latter lives thirty miles away. When full ceremonials, on the other hand, are in question, it is relationship ³⁰ which stands out. Roughly one-third of the ceremonials of the singers were for persons closely related to them by either blood or marriage. This is, of course, in part simply a function of the facts that the society is small and mainly endogamous and that matrilineal lineages tend to be concentrated in particular localities. But, with only three exceptions, persons closely related by blood or marriage to a singer called upon that singer for a full ceremonial, regardless of distance, unless the diagnostician had specifically advised a ceremonial not known to that singer. Putting it another way, the data show that a singer almost invariably conducts the ceremonials which are held over his children, his maternal nieces and nephews, his grandchildren (and the hus-

³⁰ Mainly close familial relationship. But there is some evidence that, other things being equal, a diagnostician or singer in the same clan as the patient is preferred to an outsider.

bands and wives of these three groups) and usually those which are held over his brothers and sisters (and their wives or husbands). Persons closely related to a curer frequently called upon an unrelated singer but very seldom indeed upon an unrelated curer.³¹ When illness is chronic or critical the importance of both of these first two factors is materially diminished. Then there is a strong tendency to seek out the man (with little regard for relationship³² or for distance involved) who either knows some ceremonial particularly well or who knows a ceremonial which is unknown to any member of the group but which, it is felt, may alone cure the illness. The additional factor of social prestige undoubtedly enters into the choice of an outside singer in certain cases.³³ I have been speaking specifically of singers and curers. The same principles apply in all three situations to the selection of a diagnostician. "When people live all together you don't pay much for doing hand-trembling — just pay a little corn pollen or an arrowhead." (58) But if local diagnosticians and singers have failed, the next

³¹ Actually, the practice of a number of curers is practically limited to their own family groups. They are not sufficiently recognized for outsiders to have any confidence in them.

³² Of the two local singers most in demand, Dick Pino (1) is a member of the clan (37) most numerous in the area, but Jake (2) belongs to a clan (22) which has but fifteen representatives in this area. Of the five practitioners most frequently called in from the outside three are from the first and third most populous clans (37 and 35) in the area, the fourth is from Clan 22, the fifth from Clan 20 which has but three representatives here.

³³ This factor is more difficult than the others to document with full precision. Documentation consists in the first place in the fact that (with only three exceptions, each of which was a case of critical or persistent illness) the very expensive outside singers have been imported by the few families in this region who are really prosperous economically. In the second place, numerous statements of this order provide documentation:

Richard Pino (34): "The Antonios ought to have an Enemy Way for the people. Everybody knows that. But they're too stingy."

Sam (4): "Balthazar had a Night Way down at Cerro Alto five years ago. And everybody in that outfit has been bragging about it ever since."

Antonio's wife (36): "That singer we got from Crownpoint to do Shooting Way, Male Branch for me knew so much he had to have five men help him. Nobody else around here could have paid him."

Still another point should be mentioned. It appears to be generally accepted as part of Navaho theory that the more that is paid for a ceremonial, the more effective it is likely to be.

step is very often that of calling in an outside diagnostician — and usually one who can do star-gazing or listening (methods of divination not practised by any member of this group).

Thus far we have neglected the complication that, in the greater number of cases, the choice of a singer is not direct but is mediated through the advice of a diagnostician. It is simply a matter of record that diagnosticians (except perhaps in severe cases) tend very definitely to recommend in the first instance singers and curers who are either neighbors or relatives of the patient or both. It seems fairly evident that they are adhering to a social pattern which is in large part unconscious but which nevertheless constrains the choice. The question as to whether there is connivance (or at least some kind of unformalized understanding) between particular diagnosticians and particular singers or curers at once presents itself, and I have examined the facts very carefully from this point of view. There is, in general, little support for the hypothesis that such arrangements exist. In the main, the leading diagnosticians have recommended the various singers and curers in a way which does not suggest partiality. It is true that the three daughters, son and son-in-law of Jake who are diagnosticians tend strongly to recommend Jake, his sons Margadito and Jaciano, his son-in-law Richard Pino as singers. But an examination of the cases where this was done shows that by far the greater number of the patients were also members of this extended family group. And, apart from these four diagnosticians, the records of those who have diagnosed often enough to provide a fair sample evidence primarily an adherence to the principles of relationship, geographical propinquity, and specialization; secondarily, a disposition to recommend one singer about as often as another and to show no marked preference for a particular curer.

There is one instance (involving the first introduction of a certain outside singer to this community) where connivance seems plain. During the autumn of 1936 an old woman from north of Gallup came down into the Ramah-Atarque country to pick piñons. She had no friends or acquaintances in the region, but, finding in Solao's wife (32) a fellow member of

Clan 35, she stayed for some time with that group.³⁴ When the diagnosis of the illness of one of the grandchildren presented some difficulties, she volunteered to do hand-trembling. Her recommendation was that her own son be summoned to do Eagle Way. This advice was followed, and it is interesting to note that the singer has become something of a fashion in the region. Eagle Way had not been carried out there for some time, but, after the ceremonial for the Solao group, Bluebird (10) immediately received two invitations to conduct the ceremonial for members of two other families.³⁵ Last summer he performed Eagle Way twice and Mountain Top Way once in this area (on the recommendation of local diagnosticians).³⁶

Instances of this sort where the diagnostician's position is utilized to personal or familial advantage undoubtedly occur. Theoretically, the diagnostician can consider any singer or curer he knows and any ceremonial (or supplementary ceremony, such as a specific sandpainting at additional expense). And the diagnostician could clearly (so far as actual manipula-

³⁴ A minor form of economic reciprocity between members of a clan exists in this custom whereby a traveling stranger in Navaho culture always seeks hospitality from a member of his own clan.

³⁵ Professional engagements in his own area prevented immediate acceptance, but it was arranged that he should return in about six weeks. I have, incidentally, data on ceremonials being arranged for a longer period than this in advance. Particularly in the case of singers from the outside, advantage is often taken of the presence of a singer in one's own immediate vicinity to ask him to come back "after shearing" or "after the lambs have been sold," for example. I know of cases where an outside singer has collected several such somewhat indefinite advance requests. More than once when such a singer has returned (without the invitation being renewed at the actual time by the sending of an intermediary), at least one of the families involved have greeted him with some such statement as this: "We aren't quite ready for you yet. Come back again in about two weeks." On the other hand, when such a postponement occurs, it is likely (in my observation) that some other family which have been considering having a ceremonial for one of their members will give the singer an opportunity to fill in this idle time (often at something less than his usual fee!).

³⁶ There is abundant evidence that, from time to time, different outside singers become locally fashionable. Then a case goes badly and they cease to be invited. (It is too often forgotten that the Navaho expect results — or at all events not bad results — from their singers. A singer who consistently has failures loses his practice. Of course, a considerable degree of rationalization of failure is part of the system. It is my impression that the limit of toleration of rationalization is markedly less for the singer from outside.) On the other hand, at least two outside singers have apparently enjoyed a sustained popularity in this area for twenty years or more.

tion is concerned) control the issue of the rite of diagnosis. Actually, however, this theoretically sweeping jurisdiction over ceremonial practice is sharply limited by several circumstances. First of all, the diagnostician normally discusses the alternatives with the family group before he carries out hand-trembling in their presence. If he suggests that he might "think about" a nine-night Mountain Top Way during the "hand-trembling" they are almost certain to say that it is useless because they couldn't afford it in any case. In the second place, choice is restricted by the fact that particular etiological factors tend to be associated with particular ceremonials. Further, it is perfectly clear from the data that the diagnostician, with extremely few exceptions, limits himself to the alternatives socially approved in the culture. Finally, it is not merely that the diagnostician is limited by the expressed wishes of the particular family and by the choices institutionalized in the culture.³⁷ The family often on their own responsibility reject in whole or in part the advice of the diagnostician.³⁸

Summary. 1. The principal factors (all markedly interdependent with economic situation) influencing the choice of a practitioner are close biological-sociological relationship, geographical propinquity, professional reputation of the practitioner. The relative importance of these factors varies with circumstances which have been defined, but they are listed in what is probably the modal diminishing order of importance. Clan, as such, appears to be a determinant to only a very slight degree.

2. The recommendations of diagnosticians are decidedly patterned and are also conditioned by the circumstances of the specific case.

³⁷ The carriers of the culture are not necessarily fully conscious of the preferred alternatives.

³⁸ This is a matter which I did not specifically investigate in the field, but in connection with other topics I noted eight instances in which a kind of informal family council vetoed the recommendations of a diagnostician and either called in another diagnostician or made their own independent selection of singer or ceremonial or both.

SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PATIENTS AND ASSISTANTS OR SPECTATORS AT CEREMONIALS ³⁹

The singer usually has a first assistant and several other helpers for specific ceremonies. The relationship of the first assistant is significant in respect to the singer rather than to the patient. Sometimes the singer takes with him to the ceremonial a member of his extended family group who has had some experience and training. Dick (1) and Jake (2) are quite occasionally accompanied by their sons-in-law. These two men are not trying to learn the ceremonials. Usually however the first assistant is a pupil or someone to whom the singer has taught the ceremonial, or part of it.⁴⁰ It is common, therefore, to find that the first assistant is a son, maternal nephew, or brother of the singer. Sometimes one of the singer's pupils or former pupils will not come until the last day or two of the ceremonial, and the first assistant until then (if not a relative whom the singer has brought along) is some member of the patient's family — often the father, if the patient is a young person. The secondary assistants (helpers) are provided by the patient's family. They are usually members of the extended family group, but neighbors are sometimes asked to help. In general, the only qualification is that they should have some knowledge of ceremonial procedure — specifically, no one ought to be an assistant who has not himself or herself had at least one ceremonial. (But persons may otherwise assist at their own risk — it does not affect the efficacy of the ceremonial.)⁴¹ However, those who have themselves had the cere-

³⁹ My data here consist of direct observations by myself and co-workers at forty-seven full ceremonials.

⁴⁰ Similarly, a singer will occasionally turn over to those whom he has trained (particularly if they be his own children or maternal nephews) the carrying out of the 'repeats' of his ceremonials. The patient cannot properly get someone else to finish the cycle of four, if the original singer is still alive. But that the singer is privileged to transfer the responsibility to a non-pupil, non-relative is shown in that Jake has twice done this to Dick, on the ground that "he could help the sick person more." In these cases, in addition to the routine calico and baskets, Dick was paid a share of the original fees by Jake.

⁴¹ In this paper I follow the practice used in Wyman and Kluckhohn (op. cit): any general statement such as this may be assumed to rest on a minimum of four independ-

monial seem definitely to be preferred as assistants and helpers, and in Shooting Way chants preference is given to those who have narrowly escaped death by lightning. In only one case is a particulate social relationship to the patient demanded. The man or woman who assists the patient in the ceremony of the bath must be a member neither of the patient's clan nor of the biological family.⁴² My records show only one case where this requirement was violated.

Those present (other than patient, singer, and necessary assistants) until the final day of a ceremonial are almost invariably limited to members of the patient's immediate family group and perhaps a few neighbors who happen to be close friends. Spectators gather during the final day, reaching a maximum during the concluding all-night singing. Study of the lists of those present suggests that kinship and geographical propinquity are the two principal determinants of attendance.⁴³ Only one fact which is at all remarkable emerges, namely that paternal relatives are about fifteen per cent more numerous in the lists than maternal relatives. Since this is in spite of the fact that the residence system is still more matrilocal than patrilocal, it may be significant. At the very least it affords demonstration of the bilateral character of kinship reciprocities.

That there are expected reciprocal behaviors stands out very clearly both in word and act. Juanita (15) complained bitterly that her maternal niece and foster daughter, who lives a few

ent testimonies, not contradicted by any member of the group. Where a statement is documented by less than four informants or where there are discrepancies, names or numbers of informants have been cited.

⁴² It is particularly interesting that this ceremony is singled out in view of the fact that in many pueblos (especially in the west) "the head is bathed in yucca suds by a person who stands in some special social or ceremonial relation to the subject" (usually, Dr. Parsons writes me, the father's sister or the ceremonial father's sister — not a member of the person's clan nor of his household). For calling my attention to another parallel in this connection I must thank Dr. A. H. Gayton: commonly in Central California the person who assists receives, as here, the basket as a perquisite.

⁴³ In the case of singers or ceremonials new to the region, "curiosity" enters as an additional factor of importance. Perhaps one should also mention friendship, but (often with the exception of a single close friend among younger people) one's friends in this Navaho society are usually selected from among one's kinfolk and neighbors.

miles away, had not come to assist her in cooking for the spectators during the final day and night of a Chiricahua Apache Wind Way. She remarked, "When they've got something going on up at their place, I always go up and help." Close relatives who live at a distance are often sent for (if they know the songs) to help with the singing during the final night. Many statements make it clear that there is social pressure upon brothers and sisters, uncles and aunts, and other relatives of the patient to aid by their presence and by gifts of food and money. The principal penalty for failure to do so is, of course, similar behavior when circumstances are reversed. To a lesser extent the same pattern of reciprocity applies to neighbors (the two categories are seldom mutually exclusive here).

Summary. 1. The sociological relationship of the principal assistant is usually to the singer, that of other assistants and spectators to the family of the patient. There is some evidence that paternal relatives are present in somewhat greater numbers than maternal relatives.

2. Patterned reciprocal behaviors between relatives and neighbors are in evidence.

DISCUSSION

This paper has demonstrated somewhat concretely some features of the interdependence of social and ceremonial organization in a single Navaho society. Perhaps most of the points established could have been predicted *a priori*. But, feeling as he does that neglect of the obvious has been a cardinal flaw of sociological and anthropological research, the writer is not disposed to apologize for this inductive analysis of highly specific data. He does, however, realize acutely that he has touched only upon some of the more outstanding and superficial interrelationships. Such a subtlety, for example, as the social personality of the singer deserves extended discussion. But a well-documented treatment of this and other highly engaging problems is so dependent upon knowledge of Navaho semantics that it must await — on the writer's part at all events — the acquiring of a more nearly adequate control of

the language. Simply, however, as a lead for other workers to check I submit three tentative generalizations which are highly imperfect inductions from many scattered observations in my field notes:

1. During the intervals between ceremonial procedures (and to a degree even during some of these procedures) the singer is expected to joke and maintain a jocular mien.

2. The singer is expected to be more than usually hospitable and to give liberally to friends and relatives, particularly perhaps to old people, the fees and presents which he receives.⁴⁴ A singer who was too prosperous would be regarded with reserve⁴⁵ and would often be suspect of witchcraft.⁴⁶

3. Becoming a singer is probably the principal mechanism for the "circulation of the élite" (in the Paretian sense) in Navaho society as a whole.

4. There is a considerable degree of ambivalence of feeling toward the singer. Apparently singers who are either too prosperous or who have too many failures are suspect of witchcraft. A singer whose hair is turning or has turned white is particularly liable to such suspicion. Very occasionally one hears a tale of collusion (involving persons now dead) between singer and diagnostician involving witchcraft.

⁴⁴ I am indebted to my friend, Dr. Leland C. Wyman, for first directing my attention to this last-named uniformity. Cf. also Newcomb and Reichard (op. cit.), pp. 9-10. On the whole question of the social personality of the singer see the section of this work entitled "Chant and Chanter."

⁴⁵ If there be anything in these generalizations, they would explain in large part a fact which more than one observer has commented upon: singers in Navaho society, while seldom terribly poor, are not in general as well-off as might be anticipated in view of the substantial increments to their income. In this group, Dick (1) and Jake (2) both have an extraordinary number of economic dependents, and the former is actually poor by the standards of the community.

⁴⁶ Dr. Wyman very kindly allows me to quote his written comments on these two suggestions: "Although I have no statements from the Navaho on these two points, my own observations bear them out. For instance — one or two singers whom I know as rather reserved and not inclined to have much to do with me, have been very friendly and jocular when I appeared at a hogan where they were singing. In general, members of the patient's family are much more likely than the singer to object to the presence of whites. And yet it is the singer who will be blamed if anything goes wrong. I have a general impression that one can often 'break the ice' with a singer who is difficult to know more easily at a ceremonial where he is singing than elsewhere."

In a later paper I hope to show in detail and with specific documentation how "economic" and "ceremonial" aspects of behavior interdigitate at many points. It is clear that an individual could seldom arrange to have a ceremonial carried out unless he had "economic" coöperation from the members of his immediate and extended family groups. These "economic" reciprocities involved in ceremonial behaviors are, like the "social," rather fully patterned and somewhat intricate both in operation and in their effects. Ceremonials act to some degree as "economic" levelers. Those regarded as well-off or well-to-do feel, as has been pointed out, social pressure to give the more elaborate and more expensive ceremonials. Conversely, the acquisition of ceremonial knowledge is recognized not only as an avenue to the attainment of economic security but also as a means of economic mobility.⁴⁷ But presentation of the concrete data supporting these generalizations must be reserved to a later date.

Summary

The summaries at the close of each section have provided generalizations on specific points from particulate data. These generalizations can be subsumed only in terms of the broadest tendencies:

1. Clan, as such, influences the ceremonial practices of this Navaho community comparatively slightly, but the existence of such a unit of social differentiation is, however, evident at certain points in the structure.⁴⁸

⁴⁷ If poor parents have a son who is regarded as being unusually alert and as having a good memory friends will often say "You ought to have your boy learn so and so's chant. Then, later on, he'd be able to help you all out. He would give you a lot of the things that people gave him for singing for them."

⁴⁸ In the main, however, it seems to me that this analysis bears out Dr. Parsons' generalization "Navaho clanship is dissociated with Navaho ceremonialism." E. C. Parsons (*The House-Clan Complex of the Pueblos in Essays Presented to A. L. Kroeber*, Berkeley, 1936, p. 229). There are, nevertheless, a few evidences of connection. For example, in *Enemy Way* we are told that a person from the patient's clan is usually chosen to go after the scalp "because he will do it free of charge." (Father Berard Haile, *op. cit.*, p. 219.)

2. Bilateral biological-sociological close relationship stands out as a signally important determinant of various ceremonially oriented behaviors. The local sub-group also plays a rôle of importance.

3. There is abundant demonstration that ceremonial structure is patterned with reference to social structure.

A FEATURE OF ROMAN RELIGION

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

AFTER the disastrous battle of Lake Trasimene Rome set herself to appease her gods, and by popular vote ordered the performance of a *uer sacrum*, that is, an offering of all the young of animals to be born in spring. Livy records this formula as having been submitted to the people for their approval (22.10.2-6).

uelitis iubeatisne haec fieri? si res publica populi Romani Quiritium ad quinquennium proximum, sicut uelim uoueamque, salua seruata erit hisce duellis, quod duellum populo Romano cum Carthaginiensi est quaeque duella cum Gallis sunt qui cis Alpes sunt, tum donum duit populus Romanus Quiritium quod uer attulerit ex suillo ouillo caprino bouillo grege quaeque profana erunt Ioui fieri, ex qua die senatus populusque iusserit. qui faciet, quando uolet quaque lege uolet facito; quo modo faxit, probe factum esto. si id moritur quod fieri oportebit, profanum esto, neque scelus esto. si quis rumpet occidetue insciens, ne fraus esto. si quis clepsit, ne populo scelus esto neue cui cleptum erit. si atro die faxit insciens, probe factum esto. si nocte siue luce, si seruus siue liber faxit, probe factum esto. si antidea senatus populusque iusserit fieri ac faxitur, eo populus solutus liber esto.

This was a most solemn undertaking, to be carried out with minute precision. After it was performed, twenty-one years later, says Livy, in 195 B.C., an irregularity was discovered, and the *uer sacrum* was repeated in 194.¹ Nevertheless, the people's vote asserts directly that certain things which might appear irregular were not to count as such: the mode of sacrifice was declared immaterial; any animal dying before it should be sacrificed was to count as human property and not as divine; accidental killing of a victim due to Juppiter involved no guilt, nor did the loss of such a victim through theft, or the offering of a victim on an unlucky day or too early. We might have expected the precise mode of sacrifice to be defined: certainly any one of the other circumstances might have been thought to involve the need for *piacula* or *instauratio*. The formula, presumably drawn up by the Pontifex Maximus, asserted that they did not, and made this assertion as with full authority.

¹ Livy 33.44.1-2, 34.44.1-2. This paper is indebted to Professor W. S. Ferguson for the notes which appear with his initials, and for other friendly aid.

Similar explicit phrases occur in many other texts. Livy, quoting an authoritative source, says of *deutio*; *si is homo qui deuotus est moritur, probe factum uideri*:² a later formula of *deutio* includes *tunc quisquis hoc uotum faxit, ubi faxit, probe factum uideri*.³ We may compare the consul's vow at the beginning of the war with Antiochus, *quisquis magistratus eos ludos quando ubique faxit, hi ludi recte facti donaque data recte sunt*,⁴ and the question raised before the second Macedonian War, *consultique fetiales ab consule Sulpicio, bellum quod indiceretur regi Philippo, utrum ipsi utique nuntiari iuberent, an satis esset, in finibus regni quod proximum praesidium esset, eo nuntiari. fetiales decreuerunt, utrum eorum fecisset, recte facturum*.⁵ Consider further the record of the dedication of the temple of Jupiter Liber at Furfo in 58 B.C., a text which has the old local dating *mensi Flusare* after the Roman date and which is a striking document of Italian religious conservatism before the Augustan restoration, from a time at which some would have us believe that traditional piety was dead or all but dead.⁶ This provides directly that iron may be used in work on the building, *fasque esto*, and so dispenses all concerned from a very common taboo: after all, the introduction of any iron into the temple or grove of the Arval Brothers required a *piaculum*. (This dispensation has a parallel in a text of the first half of the third century B.C. from the temple of Declunus (or Decluna) at Velitrae: *ferom pihom estu*, if we accept the explanation *ferrum pium esto*.⁷) The Furfo text proceeds to enact that any offerings or dedications made in the temple may be sold and thereby cease to be sacred (*ubei uenum datum erit, id profanum esto*): but only the aedile may sell them *sine scelere sine piaculo . . . alis ne potesto*.

Again, a formula, found both on the altar dedicated in 12/13

² 8.10.12.

³ Macrobian. Sat. 3.9.11: cf. G. Wissowa, RE. 5, 279, 6, 1153, and Wessner, *ibid.* 14.185.

⁴ Liv. 36.2.5.

⁵ Liv. 31.8.3.

⁶ C. I. L. IX 3513 = I (ed. 2), 756 = Dessau Inscr. lat. sel. 4906.

⁷ R. S. Conway, *The Italic Dialects*, 1, 267 f., no. 252: J. Whatmough, *Foundations of Roman Italy*, 387. On the other interpretation developed by Fr. Skutsch, *Kleine Schriften*, 435 ff., the text states the conditions under which a votive offering may be removed without impiety.

A.D. by the people of Narbo to *numen Caesaris Aug.*⁸ and on an altar to Juppiter Optimus Maximus at Salonae in 137 A.D.,⁹ says with reference to a sacrifice lacking one detail *idcirco tamen probe factum esto*. The Narbo altar has also the formula *si quis tergere ornare reficere uolet, quod beneficii causa fiat, ius fasque esto*.¹⁰ Both altars have the statement *ceterae leges huic arae titulisque eadem sunt, quae sunt arae Dianae in Auentino*,¹¹ and it is likely that both follow therefore a precedent of venerable antiquity.

This view is confirmed by comparison with formulas of Italian cult. A votive offering at Falerii runs thus: *Menerua sacru La. Cotena La. f. pretod (= praetor) de zenatuo sententiad uootum dedet: cuando datu rected cuncaptum*,¹² where Dessau translates the last phrase as *quocumque tempore dedicatum, recte dedicatum*.¹³ Again, in the Iguvine tablets we have phrases which are translated as *sedens quilibet commolito, sedens commolitis precator. porrectum erit*,¹⁴ *tum arx piata erit*.¹⁵ Further, the employment of *ius* where we should expect *fas* is found in formulas and is parallel.¹⁶ Again, Cicero preserves both the idea and its

⁸ C. I. L. XII 4333 = Dessau 112.

⁹ C. I. L. III 1933 = Dessau 4907.

¹⁰ Cf. C. I. L. XI 944 (near Carpi = Dessau 4909) *uti sine scelere sine fraude lic[et]* (*lic[et]*), Skutsch, op. cit., 441, n. 2, probably rightly: but there is a plain *licet* earlier).

¹¹ *titulisque* seems to be lacking on the Salonae altar (for the first half of each line of which we depend on transcripts made before its mutilation). C. I. L. XI 4766 (= Dessau 4911) at Spoleto provides for cutting timber in a sacred grove on the day of the annual sacrifice: on other days such an act entails a *piaculum* and, if done in deliberate guilt, a fine as well. They are not strictly parallel to the dispensations under discussion: for they state a specific annual exception, (in fact, the Spoleto text says *sine dolo*, not *sine piaculo*). C. I. L. VIII 11796 (= Dessau 4908) states the conditions of the dedication by an Imperial procurator of an image of Diana: it may be moved only for cleaning and repair. It is fragmentary, but in what is preserved there is none of our language of definition from the standpoint of potential religious guilt.

¹² C. I. L. I (ed. 2) 365 = Dessau 3124.

¹³ K. Latte, *Die Religion der Römer* (in A. Bertholet, *Religionsgeschichtliches Lesebuch*, ed. 2) 6 renders 'Da es geweiht ist, soll es als recht gelobt gelten,' and suggests that there may have been some uncertainty whether there had been an error in the form of the vow. (Mommсен interpreted as *aliquando*, i.e. *suo tempore, datum; recte conceptum*.)

¹⁴ F. Buecheler, *Umbrica*, 79 f. (cf. 4): I. Rosenzweig, *Ritual and Cults of pre-Roman Iguvium*, 131 (cf. 145).

¹⁵ Buecheler 81; Rosenzweig 132.

¹⁶ Cf. A. Hagerström, *Das magistratische Ius in seinem Zusammenhang mit dem römischen Sakralrechte* (Uppsala Univ. Årsskr., 1929, 8), 25, n. 1.

mode of expression in the laws proposed and discussed in his *De legibus*.¹⁷

We have thus statements that a given course of action is right, and commonly the imperative *esto*, used just as in legal texts.¹⁸ Further, the statements are made in direct form, without reference to any supernatural source of authority or to tradition. To be sure, records of public¹⁹ as well as of private *taurobolia* mention the preliminary taking of omens by the archigallus (*ex uaticinatione archigalli*), or a command by the goddess: and again, the preamble to the Acta of the celebration of Secular Games under Septimius Severus states that the games were instituted *monitu uetustissimae uatis*,²⁰ and both these and the Acta of the Games celebrated under Augustus refer to the Sibylline books (*uti uobis (tibi) in ill(e)is libris scriptum est*) in connection with the individual sacrifices prescribed in them.²¹ Nevertheless, the authority on which the Games were celebrated was that of the senate,²² and the details of the ceremony are described as performed in accordance with the decisions of the *quindecimviri*. The only other official reference which I have found to the Sibylline books as an *aition* is the local title *pater patratus populi Laurentis foederis ex*

¹⁷ So 2.20 *quaeque quoique diuo decorae grataeque sint hostiae, providento: 2.24 caste iubet lex adire ad deos, animo uidelicet, in quo sunt omnia; nec tollit castimoniam corporis: 2.28 araque uetusta in Palatio Febris et altera Esquilis Malaе Fortunae detestataque omnia eius modi repudianda sunt: 2.28 recte etiam Spes a Calatino consecrata est: 58 statuit enim collegium locum publicum non potuisse priuata religione obligari.*

¹⁸ Cf. G. Appel, *De Romanorum precationibus* (Relg. Vers. Vorarb. 7.2), 148 f. The fact that *esto* is thus used in religious texts (which are sure to be characterized by conservatism in language) to define the character of a situation, deserves to be set against Fr. Leifer's doubts whether *paricidas esto* in lex Numae ap. Fest. p. 221 M. (p. 247 Lindsay) can be taken to mean *parricida habeatur* (Studi in onore di G. Riccobono, 2, 1936, 101 ff. I naturally express no opinion on the original meaning of the phrase).

¹⁹ E.g., C. I. L. XII 4321, *iussu ipsius*. (References in private dedications to commands of Oriental and other deities are not pertinent.)

²⁰ C. I. L. VI 32326.8 (p. 3249): for another possible reference to the Sibyl in this document cf. *ibid.*, l. 20. (The preamble of the account of the Augustan celebration is lost.)

²¹ Mommsen, *Ephemeris Epigraphica*, 8, 263.

²² *Ibid.*, 244 f. Under Septimius the senate's rôle seems to be simply that of asking the emperors that the games be celebrated: the magister, in purifying the Tarentum, says that he acts *quorum* (sc. *imperatorum*) *iussu mandatuque* (*ibid.*, 292, C. I. L. VI 32328.19).

libris Sibullinis percutiendi cum p(opulo) R(omano), which may represent a piece of archaizing imagination; the text comes from the principate of Claudius.²³

On the other hand, in Greek texts some such formula as 'in accordance with the oracle of Delphi (or Dodona)' ²⁴ or 'in accordance with ancestral custom' is frequent. Further, Greek regulations of ritual present another striking difference from those which we have been considering. Whereas Roman regulations give not only prohibitions but also permissions and dispensations, Greek regulations consist mainly of prohibitions and statements imputing the guilt of impiety to this or that action, and give no comparable dispensations. This is the more remarkable in view of the fact that a regular Delphic precept ordered people to perform sacrifices 'according to the law of the city,' νόμῳ πόλεως.²⁵

The apparent exceptions which I have noted do not invalidate the principle. Thus the benefactors who restored the temple of Apollo at Gythium early in the first century B.C. were given for themselves and their descendants authority over the temple, ἐξουσίαν τοῦ τε ἱεροῦ καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱεροῦ πάντων; but that means only that the city has ceded to them its power of control, and permits them to preside and care for the temple as they choose.²⁶ The foundation inscription of Diomedon's family cult on Cos (which does not quote any oracle or other supernatural authority) provides that a forbidden use of a precinct is permitted in time of war: ²⁷ but that is mere necessity, like the Athenian omission of the rites of procession to Eleusis

²³ C. I. L. X 797 = Dessau 5004: cf. C. I. L. XIV, p. 187, n. 2. In the *Fasti Praenestini* (Dessau 8844a) we read *Mater magna ex libris Sibullinis arcessita locum mutavit ex Phrygia Romam*, but this is one of a series of learned notes in that particular calendar (cf. Varro ling. Lat. 6. 15).

²⁴ Cf. Plato, *Laws* 865B, καθαρθεὶς κατὰ τὸν ἐκ Δελφῶν κομισθέντα περὶ τούτων νόμον ἔστω καθαρὸς (a similar provision in a second century B.C. law from Lato in Crete, as restored by A. Wilhelm, *Jahresb.* 14, 1911, 203 may lack such a sanction: but the text is mutilated): also the designation of gods whose cult was prescribed by the oracle as *πυθόχρηστοι* (Dittenberger, *Syll. inscr. gr. ed.* 3, 1014). Many sacrifices fell in a different category (p. 94, n. 60, later).

²⁵ E.g. Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.1.

²⁶ L. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 163, no. 56.29.

²⁷ R. Herzog, *Heilige Gesetze von Kos* (Abh. Berlin 1927, vi) 28, no. 10 III 86.

during part of the Peloponnesian War.²⁸ Of course, texts specifying means of purification can state that after their use a man or a household is pure,²⁹ and a list of ritual regulations inscribed at Cyrene during the fourth century B.C., in addition to stating what defiles, describes also what is permissible;³⁰ but the whole text is presented as an oracle of Apollo; thus the god and not a civic authority has decided. *δσία* is here used positively, like *fas*: there is perhaps no verbal parallel in inscriptions, in which the word is rare, and parallels to the sense would be hard to find.³¹ A Coan text of about the end of the fifth century forbids any cutting of cypress trees in the precinct, or outside it, under penalty of a fine and the guilt of impiety (*τὸ ἱερὸν ἀσεβείτω*), save if the wood is wanted for some public work:³² but there

²⁸ Cf. also Thuc. 2.17, Polyb. 5.106.2-3: for an exception in a civil law Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Sitzungsab. Berlin*, 1927, 8.

²⁹ Ziehen, no. 93; Dittenberger 982.9 (*καθαροὶ ἔστωσαν αὐθημερόν*).

³⁰ A. Vogliano, *Riv. di filol.* N. S. 6, 1928, 262 ff.: G. Oliviero, *La stele dei nuovi comandamenti e dei cereali* (*Docum. ant. della Africa Ital.* 1. 1933). The regulation of the funerals of the Labyadae at Delphi, if rightly restored by Blass (Ziehen, no. 74 C 19 f.), after forbidding the setting down of the body or the making of lamentation between the house and the tomb, adds *τηνὲ δ(ὲ μὴδ) ἐν ἄγος ἔστω* which defines what is permissible and uses *ἔστω* as Roman assertions of religious propriety do *esto*. Cf. *μὴ μισαρὸν εἶμεν*, αἰ . . . in the archaic inscription from Cleonae, I. G. IV 1607 (= E. Schwyzer, *Dial. graec. exempla* 129): but, for what is more usual, see the observations of R. Hirzel, *Themis, Dike u. Verwandtes* 49 ff. on *θέμις* as often used either with a negative or in a question.

We may note the Babylonian 'sogenannten Sabbathvorschriften,' which, after defining what may not be done, state that the king is to sacrifice at night: 'seine Handerhebung ist dann bei Gott angenehm' (H. Gressmann, *Altorientalische Texte zum alten Testament*, ed. 2, 329). Translations may be misleading on such a point, but Hittite texts appear to present analogies to the Roman habit of definition: cf. J. Friedrich, *Aus dem hethitischen Schrifttum* 2 (*Der Alte Orient*, 25, 2, 1925), 13 'Nun essen (und) trinken sie, und sie gehen (dann) fort,' and the formalism of other prayers cited in this work and in A. Götze, *Kleinasien* (in *Kulturgesch. d. alten Orients*, ed. W. Otto), 144. The Hittites did not, any more than the Romans (in their official ceremonies), act as though they believed in a magical compulsion of the gods (Götze 142): but they stated with great precision what a rite was intended to secure. If we look further afield, a curse defines exactly what the deity is expected to do, or even pledged to do (cf. the curse of Theseus on Hippolytus, and that of Eshmounazar at Sidon in H. Gressmann, *op. cit.*, 447), but it is essentially a wish, even if it is a wish which implies the expectation that it will be fulfilled.

³¹ In Dittenberger 47.2 *δσία λαγχάνειν* is more likely than *δσία λαγχάνειν*: cf. J. C. Bolkestein, *Ὅσιος ἐν Εὐσεβείῃς* (*Diss. Amsterdam*, 1936), 70 f.

³² Herzog, *op. cit.*, 32, no. 11. We may note that in I. G. IX ii 1109, a text of the

is nothing like an *assertion* that the conduct is in this case positively correct.

In the *Hercules Furens* of Euripides, when Heracles is sitting with veiled head after recovering his senses and realizing that he has in madness done murder, Theseus removes the veil, saying that a mortal does not defile divine things.³³ We have a parallel in Sophocles *Antig.* 1043-4 and, although Artemis in Euripides *Hippol.* 1437 ff. explains that she may not be present at death (οὐ θέμις),³⁴ this is not a very advanced rationalism. On the other hand, when Heracles proceeds to warn Theseus to flee from the defilement attaching to himself, and Theseus replies that there is no curse from friend to friend, we have an affirmation which is clearly marked as exceptional. While the idea of a transferable pollution by blood guilt did not perhaps take as large a place in men's minds as has sometimes been supposed,³⁵ we need only look at Plato, *Laws*, p. 871A, to see that it could be treated as axiomatic: and in fact, later in the play (1324) Theseus promises to purify Heracles in Athens: that was at least a social necessity. Euripides is here, as so often, opposing the standards of nature to the standards of convention.³⁶ He was, moreover, using the traditional heroic pose — like that of Hector, who, when Polydamas urges retreat in view of an evil omen, says that the best omen is to fight for one's country (*Il.* 12.243). Hector can, it is true, quote the counsels of Zeus: but his mood is comparable with that of Theseus.

A Greek city did indeed vote to melt down old votive offerings and use the metal to make new cult objects (even in an emergency to borrow it for the issuing of currency)³⁷ or to transfer painted tablets dedicated without authority³⁸ from a shrine to its portico — an action for which modern parallels have been

second century B.C., the motive assigned for measures against the cutting of trees in the precinct of Apollo Koropaios is simply 'that the precinct may be magnificent.'

³³ vv. 1231 ff.

³⁴ Cf. *Medea* 1327.

³⁵ Cf. the criticisms of R. J. Bonner—G. Smith, *The Administration of Justice from Homer to Aristotle*, 2, 192 ff. [W. S. F.]. Their theory that 'The whole matter of pollution in homicide looks like a sort of legalized pollution which was foisted upon homicide procedure by religion for various reasons' (200 f.) is attractive. It is a question (203 ff.) whether a man, who had done what was agreed to be justifiable homicide and who was called *καθαρός*, *δσιος*, or *εὐαγής*, required a purification. If he did not, that too may have been so determined by the Delphic oracle or by the tradition of the exegetae.

³⁶ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *ad loc.*, remarks that the line, which we find so striking, is never quoted in antiquity, and suggests that this is due to its wholly exceptional character. — In the *Orestes* 75 f., Helen explains that she is not defiled by talking to Electra *because* she can refer the guilt to Phoebus.

³⁷ *Ziehen* 109, no. 38a, 204, no. 67: W. S. Ferguson, *The Treasurers of Athena*, 15, 118 ff., also 85 f., 93, 107 f.

³⁸ *Ziehen* 113, no. 39; for the need of authorization, cf. A. Rehm, *Milet.* III 172, no. 32.

noted in the Catholic Rhineland and in the Greek Church.³⁹ Yet the body having civil jurisdiction over the place of dedication had to exercise power in these matters, from necessities of space as well as for good appearances: the decrees that a statue of this or that benefactor shall stand in a given temple forever almost imply that an ordinary private dedication had no right to expect as much. Where official dedications were concerned, a propitiatory sacrifice was, sometimes at least, deemed necessary;⁴⁰ further, private votives which were removed were not taken from the deity but buried in the precinct.⁴¹ In any case, the Greek decrees in question do not contain any explicit statement like *ius fasque esto*.

Let us glance for a moment at two Greek constitutions sketched as ideals. The Athenian in Plato, Laws 828A, modestly suggests that it may be the business of the participants in the dialogue to fix when sacrifices are to be offered and how many there are to be, but that what sacrifices are to be offered and to which gods must be fixed with the aid of Delphi: the interlocutor says 'Well, the number.'⁴² Aristotle may appear to be approximating to the Roman way when he says (Politics 1322 b 25-6) *θυσίας . . . ὅσας μὴ τοῖς ἱερέουσιν ἀποδίδωσιν ὁ νόμος*, (1331 a 26-7) *ὅσα μὴ τῶν ἱερῶν ὁ νόμος ἀφορίζει χωρὶς ἢ τι μαντεῖον ἄλλο πυνθόχρηστον*, (1336 b 16-9) *τισι θεοῖς τοιοῦτοις οἷς καὶ τὸν τωθασμὸν ἀποδίδωσιν ὁ νόμος· πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἀφήσιν ὁ νόμος . . . τιμαλφεῖν τοὺς θεοὺς*, but in these quotations ὁ νόμος is not a civic ordinance: it is, as W. L. Newman says, 'an unwritten law,'⁴³ or, more simply, 'custom,' 'usage.'

It is not that the Greeks were more careful than the Romans about the supernatural. There is no Greek parallel for the

³⁹ Ibid., 114, n. 5, 206, n. 6.

⁴⁰ G. Hock, Griech. Weihegebräuche, 89 f.: on popular susceptibility, cf. Ferguson, op. cit., 107, n. 1.

⁴¹ M. P. Nilsson, A History of Greek Religion, 79: cf., for Rome, Varro ap. Gell. 2.10 and I. S. Ryberg, A.J.A. 1937, 102.

⁴² Cf. Rep. 427B: contrast Dessau 6087, lxiv.

⁴³ Vol. 3, 492 of his edition. Compare the Athenian reply to the Boeotian complaint about their use of the precinct at Delion (Thuc. 4, 98.2), *τὸν δὲ νόμον τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἶναι, ὧν ἂν ἡ τὸ κράτος τῆς γῆς ἐκάστης, . . . τούτων καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ αἰεὶ γίγνεσθαι, τρόποις θεραπεύμενα οἷς ἂν πρὸ τοῦ εἰωθόσι καὶ δύνωνται*; and Thuc. 3.58.3, *ὁ δὲ νόμος τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν μὴ κτείνειν τούτους*.

practice of *instauratio*,⁴⁴ the repetition of a whole ceremony because of some formal defect, or for the clause added to all laws *si quid ius non esset rogari, eius ea lege nihilum rogatum*.⁴⁵

In fact, we may suspect that the Greeks treated casually some violations of custom, where Romans would have been likely to rationalize the violation. Thus when the Boeotians blamed the Athenians for fortifying the precinct of Delium, doing in it all that men did on unconsecrated ground, and drawing water from a well never used except for lustral purposes, the Athenians, says Thucydides, replied that it was reasonable to suppose that the god would forgive what was done under stress of war and hardship.⁴⁶ This argument from what is reasonable, *εἰκός*, has a fifth century ring:⁴⁷ but it is likely that other such scruples were at times just disregarded, and nothing was thought of the matter, unless some politician wished to make capital out of it, or a pestilence followed. In any case, the argument from *τὸ εἰκός* involves Greek anthropomorphism:⁴⁸ you could reasonably postulate that the Olympians might act like human beings and show an indulgence which was not to be expected from *numina*. Contrast the Roman principle *cum loca capta sunt ab hostibus, omnia desinunt religiosa uel sacra esse, sicut homines liberi in seruitutem perueniunt: quod si ab hac calamitate fuerint liberata, quasi quodam postliminio reuersa pristino statui restituntur*.⁴⁹ or Cicero's statement about Pompey's abstention from touching anything in the Temple at Jerusalem, *non enim credo religionem et Iudaeorum et hostium impedimento praestantissimo imperatori sed pudorem fuisse*.⁵⁰

⁴⁴ Found at Iguvium as well as at Rome.

⁴⁵ Cicero Pro Caecina 95, de domo sua 106, and A. H. Greenidge, Roman Public Life, 239 (with the form preserved in Probus *si quid sacri sancti (sacrosancti cod. V) est, quod non iure sit rogatum, eius hac lege nihil rogatur*: Keil, Gramm. Lat. 4.273) [W. S. F.]. The power of definition rested in the *collegia* and in the senate.

⁴⁶ Thucydides 4.98.

⁴⁷ J. H. Finley, Harv. Stud. Class. Phil. 49, 1938, 54 (cf. *ibid.*, 30, 37 f., 51).

⁴⁸ As Dr. B. Einarson remarked to me.

⁴⁹ Pompon. ap. Dig. 11.7.36. Note that the Rhodians, according to Vitruv. 2.8.15, would not remove an insulting trophy set up by Artemisia, *quod nefas est tropaea dedicata remoueri*. Would not the Romans have found a way out of this?

⁵⁰ Pro Flacco 68. There was a religious kinship between Athenians and Boeotians

Again, after 403 B.C. Athens seems 'either tacitly or by formal act' to have cancelled its indebtedness to the treasury of Athena.⁵¹ This was a matter of necessity: but let us remember also the way in which the Corcyraean provision against cutting vineprops from the precinct of Zeus and from that of Alcinous had been forgotten.⁵²

The Greeks were not less secularist than the Romans. On Greek coins and other works of art commemorating alliances the chief divinity of a city stands for the city: and during the Hellenistic period and later, when a city was suffering from financial stringency, it often made a god a magistrate, i.e. it defrayed from temple funds the charges to which a magistrate was liable. In fact, to Polybius and to other Greek observers the striking feature of Roman life was the part played in it by *δεισιδαιμονία*, fear of the gods, and Cicero and Virgil alike accepted this estimate.

The difference lies in the Roman principle of authority and in the systematization which they made on that basis. Consider portents — *τέρατα*, *prodigia*. They were divagations from the order of nature, eclipses, earthquakes, monstrous births and so forth. Greeks and Romans alike regarded them as indications that, from the standpoint of the city's relations with its gods, all was not well, and took some action to propitiate the supernatural. But only Romans had this formalized as *procuratio prodigiorum*, a regular proceeding, initiated by the Senate and deemed necessary only when the *prodigium* had been observed on public land.⁵³ A Greek army, like individual Greeks, observed omens: but there is nothing in Greece which corresponds to *auspicia*⁵⁴ as the concomitant of *imperium*, just as in fact there is nothing which corresponds to *imperium*. A Greek may often have thought that the making of a large image

which was here lacking (the Romans also drew a line in their acceptance of Italian deities: G. Wissowa, *Religion und Kultus der Römer*, ed. 2, 49): but, even so, the contrast is striking.

⁵¹ Ferguson, *op. cit.*, 128.

⁵² Thuc. 3.70. Herzog, *Heil. Gesetze*, 33 notes that on Cos it was soon necessary to repeat the prohibition on cutting trees in the sacred grove.

⁵³ Mommsen, *Ges. Schr.* 7, 168.

⁵⁴ On which cf. now H. Ericsson, *Arch. f. Rel.* 33, 1936, 294 ff.

magnified a god and that sacrifice not only conciliated the deity to whom it was offered, but also strengthened his power to aid: yet he had nothing corresponding to the Roman phrase *macte hoc sacrificio esto*.⁵⁵

The control of religion was centralized at Rome in a degree unknown in Greece,⁵⁶ and those who controlled it claimed that their decisions were valid in heaven as on earth. Some such claim may appear to be implicit in all systems of ritual; in all of them symbolic action is credited with supernatural validity, in all of them purity and impurity, conformity and failure to conform are defined, in all of them methods of removing impurity and expiating disobedience are prescribed. Yet there is something individual in this Roman attitude. It is not a legal fiction — like the negative confession of the dead man in Egypt, whereby he asserted that he was innocent of a long list of sins and his assertion *ipso facto* had the effects of reality, or the statement that this or that Egyptian king was not dead.⁵⁷ It is legal in form, and it accepts and defines the situation,⁵⁸ and its definition is explicit and not implicit.

The spirit of Roman authority in religion is expressed in words which Livy 39.16.6–7 puts in the mouth of the consul who addressed the Roman people in 186 B.C. about the Bacchanalia.

nihil enim in speciem fallacius est quam praua religio. ubi deorum numen praetenditur sceleribus, subit animum timor, ne fraudibus humanis uindicandis diuini iuris aliquid inmixtum uiolemus. hac uos religione innumerabilia decreta pontificum, senatus consulta, haruspicum denique responsa liberant.

The Delphic oracle at its height could have made similar claims for its pronouncements; *haruspicum responsa* would have been comprehensible to a Greek, but not *senatus consulta*.⁵⁹ We

⁵⁵ On which cf. now O. Skutsch–H. J. Rose, *Cl. Quart.* 32, 1938, 220 ff. (It should be noted that this formula is used not only in sacrifices to the native Roman deities, but also to the Moerae and all the other deities of the Secular Games: *C. I. L.* VI 32323.98, etc.)

⁵⁶ M. P. Nilsson, *Röm. Mitt.* 48, 1933, 245 ff.

⁵⁷ Or, at Rome, the various ways in which a blind eye was turned to unfavorable omens.

⁵⁸ For 'the definition of the situation' as a general phenomenon, cf. W. I. Thomas, *Primitive Behavior*, 8.

⁵⁹ On *decreta*, cf. A. S. Pease ad *Cic. De diuinatione* 2.73; Fr. Fürst, *Die Bedeutung des auctoritas im privaten u. öffentlichen Leben des röm. Rep.* (Diss. Marb. 1934), 33 f.

should be hard put to it to find a Greek parallel for the decree of the *pontifices* relieving the *flamen Dialis* of some of the taboos incumbent on his office.⁶⁰ Again, there are various traditions asserting that under a variety of circumstances the practice of human sacrifice was replaced here or there by some other rite; but no Hellenistic king forbade it as the Roman senate and Roman emperors did.⁶¹

The Athenian *exegetai* seem to have confined themselves to routine functions: in any case, their supposed function was to interpret traditional rules.

⁶⁰ Aul. Gell. 10.15.17-8.

Lysias 30.17 ff. (to which Professor W. S. Ferguson drew my attention) accuses Nicomachus, one of the *anagrapheis* entrusted with the codification of Athenian laws in 403-1 B.C., of adding sacrifices which cost annually six talents and thereby causing ancestral sacrifices costing three talents a year to remain unoffered, *ἀθυστα*, for lack of funds, in the year before the trial. Probably these sacrifices were not omitted from the new calendar, but were neglected simply because there was no cash available (W. S. Ferguson, *Classical Studies* presented to Edward Capps, 150, n. 26). Now Lysias, in deploring this, refers to the prosperity enjoyed by the Athenians of old who performed these sacrifices in accordance with the *κῆρυβεις* (Solonian laws) and argues that their descendants should perform them, if for no other reason, at least for the good fortune which accrued from them. The basis for the city's provision of funds was the *κῆρυβεις* — as in its grant to the sacrifices of the Salaminioi (Ferguson, *Hesperia*, 7, 1938, 67) — not an oracle. Was there a distinction between (a) sacrifices ordered by an oracle, and offered by the *hieropoioi* (Aristotle, 'Aθ. Πολ. 54.6) and (b) other sacrifices, which were offered in accordance with a tradition which enjoyed the prestige of time and civic custom but which (in spite of the general Delphic sanction for civic law and the fact that law could be regarded as both a divine gift and a human invention: Demosth. 25.16) could be ignored without downright impiety? So far as I am aware, a Greek city made its thankofferings to the gods, and established festivals in perpetuity, without binding itself to such perpetuity by anything like a Roman *uotum*. Accordingly, any omissions in this area are in no sense parallel to relaxations of requirements of ceremonial purity, which were directly the affair of the gods. (When elderly women were substituted for virgins in priesthoods, Arch. f. Rel. 23, 1925, 30, we do not know the exact form in which it was done: Diod. Sic. 16.26.6 says of the change at Delphi *φασιν . . . τοὺς δὲ Δελφοὺς νομοθετῆσαι*. But was the oracle consulted, on such an occasion, or again when, in Plutarch's time (Q. G. 38 p. 300A), the people of Orchomenus transferred the priesthood of Dionysus from the family of Zoilus?)

⁶¹ Cf. again the action of M. Aurelius: *sacra Serapidis a uulgaritate Pelusiaca* (or *-ia*) *summouit* (Hist. Aug. uit. M. Ant. phil. 23.8). Claudius in 41 A.D. limited the *instauratio* of horseraces in *ludi* to one day (Cassius Dio 60.6.5: L. R. Taylor, *Trans. Am. Phil. Ass.* 68, 1937, 295) and in 43 abolished many sacrifices and festivals, since 'most of the year was being spent on them and the treasury had no small loss,' in addition to making yet other economies (Cassius Dio 60.17.1-2). Two years later he restored the fifth day which Caligula had added to the Saturnalia and which had been discontinued (60.25.8), and it is possible that Claudius mainly abolished innovations of the previous principate and in particular new festivals in honor of members of the Imperial family.

In the later Republic and under the Empire the range of Roman worships continued to increase, and the attitudes of Roman worshippers at large to diversify. Neither development was wholly new, and neither destroyed the principle of authority. Aurelian's new college of *pontifices Solis* is in the tradition of the Romanization of Cybele nearly five centuries earlier: his request to the Senate to send a *pontifex* to dedicate the restored temple at Palmyra ⁶² gave to Rome a primacy exceeding anything which had been seen before: and the centralization of power in the person of the *princeps*, who was also *pontifex maximus*, only confirmed and focussed what had always been characteristic of Rome.

Students of church history have generally recognized that the differences between the Latin Church and the Greek Church turn largely on the legalism of the West. Can we not go further and detect a specific inheritance of this precise tendency to define, not only *de facto*, but *de iure*, what is permissible? As Professor G. La Piana has remarked,⁶³ in the Orthodox and the other eastern churches the form of baptism is 'N. is baptized in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' and the form of absolution is 'May God forgive thy sins; in the name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,' whereas in the Latin Church the forms are not these, but 'I baptize thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,' and

According to Aelian fr. 47, after the Delphian oracle had ordained that the Locrians should send two maidens annually to the temple of Athena at Ilion, and had further explained that a pestilence which ensued was due to their failure to replace the original pair, Antigonus (which Antigonus it was, is uncertain: A. Wilhelm, *Jahreshefte* 14, 1911, 187) was asked to decide which Locrian city must pay this human tribute, and ordered them to settle the matter by drawing lots: but he was simply acting as arbitrator on a matter of detail. An Attalid letter in C. B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period*, 115 no. 24 determines the privileges of a newly established priesthood; but that side of religion was in the Greek world regularly a matter for civil authority, and anything concerning finance and establishment was or could be a royal interest. Kings and others recognized rights of asylum and also the establishment of new festivals for which privileges were claimed: in this again, they confirmed what was a civic claim and in Welles 197 ff. no. 49, 202 ff. no. 50, Eumenes II makes a similar request of a Carian city and Cos.

⁶² Hist. August. uita Aureliani 31.9. His action in reference to Paul of Samosata (Euseb. Hist. eccl. 7.30.19) is in some ways comparable.

⁶³ In an unpublished paper, here quoted by the kindness of its writer.

'I absolve thee in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.'

This is a momentous difference, and we may remark that long before forms of absolution in the first person had developed, and even before any belief in the prerogative of the church to absolve from mortal sins was accepted, the Roman bishop Callistus claimed the right to determine that this or that offence was not a mortal sin.⁶⁴ Tertullian's quotation of his edict as *ego et moechiae et fornicationis delicta paenitentia functis dimitto*⁶⁵ may not be literally exact, but it indicates the attitude involved. The power of definition is a necessary part of any religion which bases conduct on a written revelation, and there are both Rabbinic and early Christian precedents. Nevertheless, is it fanciful to see, in this and in much of the later evolution, an offshoot of the Roman tradition of asserting that a given act was free of guilt? *profanum esto*.

⁶⁴ Contrast the vision of Hermas, which informed him of a special forgiveness for one mortal sin, and compare the whole story of Cyprian and the *lapsi* (H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, 2, 231 ff.).

⁶⁵ *De pudicitia* 1. The East was not always more rigorous (cf. Dionys. Corinth. ap. Euseb. H. E 4.23.6), but was liable to take a somewhat different view of sins (K. Holl, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum*, 226; E. Schwartz, *Bussstufen und Katechumenatsklassen*, 11).

On the development of the West, see now the monographs by U. Gmelin, G. Roethe and W. Pewesin in *Geistige Grundlagen römischer Kirchenpolitik* (*Forsch. zur Kirchen- u. Geistesgeschichte* 11, 1937).